

poration for the unexpired portion of the term of 2 years from January 22, 1934, vice Harvey C. Couch, resigned.

Charles T. Fisher, Jr., of Michigan, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for the unexpired portion of the term of 2 years from January 22, 1934, vice John J. Blaine, deceased.

UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE

Clifton Mathews, of Arizona, to be United States circuit judge, ninth circuit, to succeed William H. Sawtelle, deceased.

SUPERINTENDENT OF THE MINT

Edwin H. Dressel, of Philadelphia, Pa., to be superintendent of the mint of the United States at Philadelphia, Pa., in place of A. Raymond Raff.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

A. Raymond Raff, of Philadelphia, Pa., to be collector of customs for customs collection district no. 11, with headquarters at Philadelphia, Pa., to fill an existing vacancy.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 13, 1935

RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

Hubert D. Stephens to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

UNITED STATES MARSHALS

Loomis E. Cranor to be United States marshal, western district of Kentucky.

John J. Barc to be United States marshal, eastern district of Michigan.

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY

TO BE REAR ADMIRAL

John Downes.

TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDERS

Harvey R. Bowes	Henry S. Neilson
Paul L. Mather	Earl LeR. Sackett
Arthur W. Peterson	Warner W. Angerer
Clarence H. Pike	Richard S. Morse
Harold R. Holcomb	George A. Seitz

TO BE LIEUTENANTS

Daniel J. McCallum	Eugene D. Sullivan
Louis Roedel	Joe W. Stryker
Robert S. Bertschy	William C. Latrobe
Phillip D. Compton	David A. Hurt
Elmer C. Buerkle	David M. Tyree

TO BE LIEUTENANTS (JUNIOR GRADE)

William J. Sisko
George DeMetropolis

TO BE PASSED ASSISTANT SURGEONS

Carl H. McMillan	William E. Carskadon
John L. Enyart	John P. Wood

TO BE PAYMASTER

Frank Humbeutel

TO BE CHIEF BOATSWAINS

William H. Daly	Henry K. Wombacher
George E. Cook	Raymond F. Purcell

TO BE CHIEF ELECTRICIANS

John T. McNulty	John R. Lambert
James B. Glackin	Harry A. Stafford
Elof W. Hermanson	

TO BE CHIEF RADIO ELECTRICIANS

Douglas N. Thomas	Thomas A. Garrett
James W. Anderson	Mack C. Veltman
Peter A. E. Greenwell	

TO BE CHIEF MACHINIST

Forrest G. Windsor

TO BE CHIEF PHARMACISTS

Joseph H. Bell	Allan D. Spaulding
John R. Dakin	Harry N. Trotter

MARINE CORPS

Alton A. Gladden to be major.
Richard M. Cutts, Jr. to be captain.
Frank D. Weir to be captain.
Merlin F. Schneider to be captain.
Chester R. Allen to be first lieutenant.
Lloyd H. Reilly to be first lieutenant.

POSTMASTERS

FLORIDA

Minnie H. Vick, Apopka.
George H. Stokes, Callahan.
Matye E. Mills, Cross City.
James L. Crayden, Eustis.
Alexander G. Shand, Fort Lauderdale.
Hugh M. Edwards, Mayo.
Hansel D. Leavengood, Ocala.
John P. Puckett, Perry.
James D. Pearce, St. Petersburg.
Owen L. Godwin, Sebring.

VERMONT

Charles R. Hazen, Chester Depot.
J. Clarence Nolin, Jericho.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 13, 1935

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we thank Thee that the gates of refuge stand open day and night. Our Jehovah Father, who keepeth Israel, neither slumbers nor sleeps amid the wildest winds that blow. We are grateful, blessed Father, for Thy marvelous revelation which Thou dost make of Thyself to the children of men. We believe that the future is radiant with wonderful disclosures yet to come. We pray Thee to arm us with choice of purpose and with urge of soul. O move upon our spiritual natures that we may hear Thy voice, feel Thy presence, and go forward in unfaltering footstep. Blessed Lord, may the day soon dawn in all our land when the rich and the poor shall struggle for the right of sharing the present-day burdens, and with clasped hands may they climb toward the heights where dwell contentment and peace. O hearken unto us, for our hopes, our faith, and our prayers are all with Thee. In our Savior's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Horne, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed a concurrent resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 12. Concurrent resolution directing the Federal Trade Commission to make an investigation of propaganda regarding Federal legislation on the subject of holding companies.

THE BONUS BILL

Mr. EAGLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a copy of the speech I made over the radio last night.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. EAGLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I submit the following address on the Soldiers' Bonus, made by me from Washington, D. C., March 12, 1935:

Fellow citizens of the United States, let me first express my appreciation to the National Broadcasting Co. for its courtesy in tendering to me the use of this great Nation-wide facility for 15 minutes to speak on the subject of the bonus.

The precise question before the Congress at this time is whether the World War soldiers' adjusted-service certificates shall be paid

at this time in advance of their maturity date of 1945; and if so, how they shall be paid.

Such adjusted-service certificates are often referred to and designated as the "bonus."

In the proposal for the payment of the bonus there is to be no new debt created. There is no proposal to hand out a bonus or a gratuity. Already 3,550,000 World War veterans have in their possession adjusted-service certificates signed by the Government promising to pay each his certificate in the year 1945, 10 years hence, that are just as binding on the Government as the bonds of the Government now outstanding that the Government also promises to pay in 1945. Hence the payment of that so-called "bonus" at this time would be merely paying 10 years sooner than its legal due date a debt already recognized in writing by the Government according to an act passed by the Congress and signed by the President several years ago.

The first question is, Whether the bonus certificates should be paid now or payment postponed until their maturity date in 1945? My own position is that if the Government can put out, as it has done by act of Congress, billions of dollars as grants, as gratuities, as loans on doubtful security, and as blessings to corporations, to which the Government did not owe either a legal, a financial, or even a moral obligation, why not anticipate the time of payment of a real debt already existing especially when it affects 3,550,000 veterans who went to war and took the sacrifice of that noble adventure; especially when these veterans now need their adjusted pay as much if not more than any railroad or bank or insurance company or building-and-loan association or any other big business enterprise ever needed money, and are far more entitled to it than any such were ever entitled to the grants and loans and gratuities we in the Congress and Government accorded to them during the past 2 years of panic and depression?

Besides, the banking institutions of the country, which the Congress first aided and kept from going broke—when we had no legal or even moral obligation to do so—by first making eligible to rediscount almost all paper in their portfolios so that they could bring to their vaults unlimited quantities of Federal Reserve notes with which to meet all runs upon them, then by buying vast quantities of their long-term paper, then by guaranteeing their bank deposits, then by purchasing their preferred shares—so that the banking institutions thus were helped from a state of impending ruin into a state of security and safety—have not lent and are not lending to business and the public, so as to help restore the country to normal business activity. The plain truth is that in March and April 1933 there were outstanding seven and one-half billions of currency, and now there are outstanding only about five billions of currency of all of the seven forms. When the financial system of the Nation has contracted the currency by two and one-half billions of dollars in the past 2 years, and when the same financial system refuses to aid business recovery by backing business in the country with loans, which as checking accounts would take the place of currency, either the country will probably slip back into disaster and chaos with whatever follows or else the Congress must perform its duty under the Constitution with regard to money. Under the Constitution the duty is placed upon the Congress to determine the proper volume of money needed by the entire country.

Under the Gold Standard Act of March 14, 1900, requiring a 40-percent gold coverage for outstanding currency, the more than \$8,000,000,000 of gold now in the Treasury would legally justify a total issuance of more than \$20,000,000,000 of currency. As against such twenty billions legally possible to be issued there are outstanding only five billions. If the banks can deflate the currency at will by two and one-half billion dollars—until there is a dearth of actual money among the people, which is retarding recovery—why cannot the Congress, in the performance of its constitutional duty "to coin money and regulate the value thereof", authorize the increase of the currency by two and one-fourth billions of dollars without being accused of inflation by the financial powers and big business, which for so long have dominated the public thought and the business activity and the very destiny of the whole masses of the people?

Under the Patman bonus bill there is no proposal to create any new debt; no proposal to issue any tax-exempt, interest-bearing bonds; no proposal to levy taxes to raise such two and one-fourth billion dollars of money necessary to pay the bonus; and such additional two and one-fourth billions of currency, if and when issued, will be backed more than dollar for dollar with gold actually in the Treasury, although the law requires only 40 percent in gold coverage. There is not a single element of inflation in the proposal. The new money would not be "greenbacks", not "wheelbarrow money", not "flat money", not "printing-press money", not "baloney money."

This reasonable increase in the outstanding volume of circulating medium in the form of Treasury notes, to be paid directly to 3,550,000 veterans, in the aggregate of \$2,300,000,000, not only will pay a debt recognized by the Government under authority of the Congress enacted years ago and approved by the then President, but will add a necessary increase of currency diffused uniformly throughout the country and will restore purchasing power and a large measure of prosperity.

There are two bills before the House of Representatives at this time to be considered and acted upon during the course of this present week. The first is called the "Patman bill, H. R. 1," and the second is called the "Vinson bill, H. R. 3896."

The Patman bill has been before the Congress and the whole country for some 6 years and is well understood. It was the only

bill before the American Legion at Miami last year when they adopted a resolution by vote of some 5 to 1 in favor of the immediate payment in cash of the bonus. The Vinson bill has been drafted and introduced into the Congress within the last 2 months. There was no Vinson bill during the past 6 years when the veterans and the Congress and the country were considering the question of the payment of the bonus.

The differences between the Patman bill and the Vinson bill are these:

Under the Patman bill there will be immediately issued Treasury notes to the extent of about two and one-fourth billion dollars founded on gold in the Treasury even more than dollar for dollar; and such Treasury notes will be paid directly to the 3,550,000 veterans. That will cancel a debt the Government confesses it owes the veterans. Under the Patman bill there would be no bonds issued by the Government to require added taxation on the public for interest and ultimate redemption; nor would there be any taxes levied for the purpose of raising such two and one-fourth billions of dollars in lieu of a bond issue; but there would be an immediate increase in the outstanding volume of the circulating medium in the form of Treasury notes.

The Vinson bill merely recites a lot of laws and facts and has but one paragraph containing any meat in it whatsoever, and that is paragraph 5, that provides: "There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such amounts as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act." That is to say, under the Vinson bill the veterans would get absolutely nothing. The whole substance of the Vinson bill is that it authorizes that about two and one-fourth billion dollars be appropriated for the purpose of paying such bonus certificates. If the Vinson bill were passed and approved, the veterans would be no better off than they are right now, when they already hold the Government's written obligation to pay them their certificates. It would be the beginning of years and years of struggle to have the Appropriations Committee appropriate two and one-fourth billions of dollars out of the Treasury, and of the Ways and Means Committee to levy taxes to collect in that two and one-fourth billion dollars, or of the Congress enacting that bonds should be sold to obtain such two and one-fourth billions of dollars. In the last instance the interest of such bonds during their normal life would amount to the same two and one-fourth billion dollars that would be secured by the sale of bonds at this time—so that the country would ultimately pay four and one-half billions of dollars instead of the two and one-fourth billions of dollars required for the payment of the bonus under the Patman bill.

It is perfectly obvious to any sincere and thoughtful mind that the Vinson bill does not pay the bonus, does not provide how it shall be paid, does not provide the means or machinery of its payment, but merely authorizes its payment. Then the real fight would be on for the next several years in the Congress and in the country over getting an appropriation to make that payment and over the question of whether it should be paid by the sale of interest-bearing, tax-exempt bonds or by the levy of taxes directly upon the people.

No such doubt and confusion and disappointment and injury could possibly happen if the Patman bill shall pass and become law. It provides the amount and directs the payment, the means of payment, and the method.

Under the Patman bill the veterans will actually get their bonus payments; under the Vinson bill they certainly will not get their payments.

Of course, if a Congressman or Senator votes for the Vinson bill he can then say that he voted for a bonus bill, because it is labeled "bonus bill"; and even if he does not want the veterans to be paid, he would be safe to vote for the Vinson bill, because under it the veterans certainly will not be paid.

But, if men believe as I do, that this debt due in 1945 by the Government to the veterans may more justly be anticipated by payment now than the billions and billions the Congress have poured out for the benefit of the big business institutions of the land in the last 2 years, and that it is safe to issue this additional two and one-fourth billions in Treasury notes backed at par by gold direct to the veterans in payment of that debt, and that the plan of the Patman bill is sound in saving the issuance of interest-bearing, tax-exempt bonds and in avoiding the levying of additional taxes, and that such new currency based on gold in hand would be a blessing to the whole country as well as to the veterans, and that under the Vinson bill the veterans will not be paid, there will be very little doubt that the Patman bill will pass the Congress in preference to the Vinson bill.

I can think of no other class of American citizens more worthy to be treated, not with generosity but with simple justice and due consideration than that splendid group of 3,550,000 World War veterans, many of them now in dire distress, who in the heyday of their glorious youth gave their all unstintingly to the service of their country on the fields of war.

As a Member of the Congress in 1917 I voted that those young fellows enter the World War. My heart swelled with pride at their heroism and deeds of valor. They reflected new glory upon our country. They are foremost now in maintaining the best traditions of American citizenship. They are a pillar of strength in the confusion and amidst the strident voices of un-American doctrine too often heard in the land. And it will be an inspiring event when this delayed measure of appreciation and justice shall be done to as noble a band of patriots as ever carried the American banner.

Good night.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. KNUTE HILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the regular order of business on Friday I may be permitted to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. In view of the statement the Chair made the other day, he asks the gentleman to defer that request until tomorrow.

Mr. KNUTE HILL. Very well.

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMITTEE—LEAVE TO SIT DURING SESSIONS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce be permitted to sit during the sessions of the House for the next 3 weeks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

HOLDING COMPANY LEGISLATION PROPAGANDA

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, the Membership of the House has been flooded with letters of various sorts with reference to the so-called "holding companies bill." The vast majority of these letters have been denounced as propaganda in certain high places. I think it is a fair statement to say that in the vast majority of instances it is propaganda. Various letters that come to us have the same beginning, and with others there is a certain sameness about them. I hold in my hand here 23 suggested letters that one company has asked its employees to send out to their Senators and Representatives, and I ask unanimous consent at this time to insert in the RECORD the first paragraph of each one of these letters, so that Members may understand when getting letters which start with these same paragraphs where the suggestion comes from.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAYBURN. Yes.

Mr. SNELL. If the gentleman is going to put in part of a letter, why not put in the whole letter?

Mr. RAYBURN. I thought it would take up too much of the RECORD.

Mr. SNELL. Let us have the whole argument instead of part of it. I do not care what it is, but I do not think the gentleman should select one sentence out of somebody's argument which, standing by itself, might carry a false impression.

Mr. RAYBURN. The first sentence of these letters is not argument.

Mr. SNELL. What is the first sentence?

Mr. RAYBURN. I have received many letters containing the statement, "I have read considerable about Senate so-and-so and House so-and-so," and another one, "I have read carefully Senate so-and-so," or, "I have just written the two Senators from my State and now I am writing you."

Mr. SNELL. What is the reason for putting that in the RECORD?

Mr. RAYBURN. I simply want the Membership of the House to know and the country to know that these "canned" letters we are getting have their origin in the offices of these superholding companies.

Mr. SNELL. Then the gentleman takes the position that a man has no right to petition Congress or to write to his Senator or Representative about a matter in which he is interested?

Mr. RAYBURN. I do not.

Mr. SNELL. Why should they not do that?

Mr. RAYBURN. I am not saying they should not. I simply want to show where this "canned" propaganda comes from.

Mr. SNELL. Have they put out any more propaganda than was put out by the President in his message of yesterday, notwithstanding the fact that 2 weeks ago he said he was not going to make public utterance respecting legislation before Congress?

Mr. RAYBURN. And who told the gentleman that?

Mr. SNELL. I saw it in the newspaper.

Mr. RAYBURN. I am not responsible for that. It has always been the habit of Presidents to communicate their views to Congress upon the state of the Union and upon other matters.

Mr. SNELL. If the gentleman puts in the whole letter, I shall not object.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAYBURN. If I have the time.

Mr. BLANTON. If every Member who is getting these propaganda letters will just send a copy of the President's message of yesterday back to the writers of the letters I think it will enlighten a great many of them. If the gentleman from New York forces the whole instead of just a short excerpt from all of these 23 letters to be printed, then the minority leader will be responsible for this extra cost of printing.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. RAYBURN. Does the gentleman from New York object?

Mr. SNELL. I object unless the gentleman puts in the whole letter. I object to a part of it being put in.

Mr. RAYBURN. Then, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert all of these 23 suggestions.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. SNELL. I am not going to object if the gentleman will put in the whole letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXPLANATION OF VOTE

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I omitted to announce that my colleague from New York [Mr. BUCKLEY] had been suddenly taken ill. If he had been here, he would have voted for the Home Owners' Loan Corporation bill.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from New York give us the program for tomorrow? Can the gentleman tell us whether we are going through as was expected and have the bonus bill before us?

Mr. O'CONNOR. As to the bonus bill, I may say that the Rules Committee held a hearing for 2 hours this morning and came to no conclusion as to what form of rule, if any, the committee would report out. The committee planned to meet again this afternoon, but we now find the Committee on Ways and Means has not yet reported the bill from the committee. That being the situation, of course, we cannot bring out a rule until the bill is reported. So the meeting which was scheduled for this afternoon will be postponed and the committee will meet tomorrow morning in executive session to further consider what form of rule, if any, will be brought out to consider the bonus bill. The bonus bill cannot be taken up tomorrow.

Mr. SNELL. May we take it for granted from the statement just made by the Chairman of the Rules Committee that the probabilities are that the bonus bill will not come before Congress before next week?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I think that is a fair estimate of what will happen.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. And in that event we will take up the Agriculture Department appropriation bill tomorrow.

Mr. SNELL. We will start that tomorrow morning?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Yes, sir; I expect to.

Mr. SNELL. And the probabilities are we will adjourn over Saturday?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I hope we may adjourn over Saturday. However, I am very anxious to set a day for the consideration of the Private Calendar. We have over 200 bills on that calendar now, and I expected to take the first opportunity to give a day to that calendar.

Mr. SNELL. I think the gentleman should give us notice of at least a day or two before taking up the Private Calendar. As far as we are concerned, we are willing to cooperate and take it up at most any time.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I hope we can adjourn over Saturday, but if possible I want to take a day next week on the Private Calendar.

Mr. SNELL. I think that is a good idea.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Well, I hope the gentleman does not take up the Private Calendar until we have a chance to take up the proposed rule for a different method of consideration.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Oh, certainly.

Mr. SNELL. Well, when will the gentleman bring in his proposed rule?

Mr. O'CONNOR. We have been waiting to hear from the Members as to how they like it.

Mr. SNELL. I did not know the gentleman always considered the Members.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Oh, yes. [Laughter.]

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, in reply to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNELL], with reference to the President's message on yesterday, that message was sent here, submitting a report from the Power Policies Commission.

Now, as to the charge that that message is propaganda, I submit that on every report that has been sent here by the President there has been a message come with it, but if the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNELL] thinks that that message is propaganda he ought to read the mail that comes to my desk and the desks of other Members every morning.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. This bill has been before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce for 3 weeks, and we were discussing it.

Mr. RANKIN. The bill was being discussed in committee?

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. Yes. And it was unusual for the President to send in a message like that when the committee was carefully taking up the measure for consideration.

Mr. RANKIN. I hope they bring it out and let us pass it without delay. The gentleman from Ohio knows that his own President, Mr. Harding, went before the Senate on a bill after it had passed the House at one time. There is certainly nothing unusual in the President sending in a message on so vital an issue, even if it is being considered by a committee.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] has expired.

FIRST DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1935

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 6644) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1935, and prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1935, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H. R. 6644, the first deficiency appropriation bill, with Mr. COLE, of Maryland, in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to my colleague from Texas [Mr. BLANTON].

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, it is very evident to every posted Member of this House that there is no chance to get out of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization any bona fide measure to restrict immigration or to stop it. So, if we expect to get a bill passed in this Congress to stop immigration and save American jobs for Americans, it must be done by the House itself and we must take that proposal away from the committee.

The Chairman of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization has demonstrated that he is not in favor of such a plan. He admitted on the floor the other day that he had put in what he called his "deadhouse" in the last Congress all such measures. He admitted that by his vote he killed the Dies bill. He cast the deciding vote in his committee against the Dies bill, which sought to restrict immigration to 60 percent of present quotas. This is clearly

shown by the colloquys I will quote from the speech of the Chairman of the Immigration Committee [Mr. DICKSTEIN] from the RECORD of February 19, 1935, page 2232, to wit:

Mr. DIES. That was on a bill introduced by myself, which provided for a reduction in quota to 60 percent and undertook to do what the gentleman from New York always said he wanted to do.

Mr. BLANTON. And his vote killed it?

Mr. DIES. That is true.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. May I say that there was a bill introduced by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SCHULTE]. There was also a bill introduced by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES]. These two bills were considered together. They were H. R. 4114 and H. R. 8222.

The two bills were beaten by one vote in committee, and I was simply carrying out a message from the American people.

And that one vote that killed those two bills was the vote of the chairman of the committee [Mr. DICKSTEIN], who cast the deciding vote in his committee that killed this restrictive legislation proposed for so many years in said committee.

But let me quote further from Chairman DICKSTEIN's speech of February 19, 1935:

Mr. DIES. I think the gentleman will agree that there are a number of aliens in this country illegally who ought to be out of the country.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. DIES. I think our committee has found that to be a fact time and time again.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. There is no question about the gentleman's statement.

Here is another:

Mr. DIES. Is the gentleman in favor of excluding all new seed immigration if we reunite families?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I am in favor of reuniting families.

Chairman DICKSTEIN admitted in his said speech that he caused my bill to stop all immigration for 10 years, and all the other numerous bills to restrict immigration, to be put in his "deadhouse." He said:

There were a number of bills before the committee and we unanimously agreed to put all the other bills in "the deadhouse", if that is the proper term, and take up House bill 4114, which was the Dies bill, dealing with all the questions.

Notwithstanding that Chairman DICKSTEIN represents a New York district with many foreigners in it, he admitted "that there is not a family in his district that has a relative on the other side." He shows just how liberal he has been in allowing foreigners to come into his district. He certainly has been reuniting families. Let me quote his admission from pages 2233-2234 of the RECORD:

Mr. DIES. Except I do not think the gentleman is bona fide in favor of restriction, and I do not blame him; he represents a district where 80 percent are opposed to it. We might as well be frank about it.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Suppose I told the gentleman that there is not a family in my district that has a relative on the other side.

To which the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] replied:

Mr. DIES. The gentleman always votes against anything in favor of restriction.

My colleague from Texas [Mr. DIES] served on this committee for several years, and is one of the best-posted men on the committee relative to aliens in this country, and the attitude of the committee chairman, and this is what he then said to Chairman DICKSTEIN:

Mr. DIES. Yes; there are 3,500,000 illegally in the country, but the gentleman is not offering to exclude them; he is not in favor of that; he is in favor of their becoming American citizens regardless of how they came into the country.

And just as Bruno Hauptmann did, these 3,500,000 aliens now in the United States unlawfully, violated our laws when they came across our borders, and are continuing to violate our laws by staying here unlawfully, for they are here illegally, and every one of them either has a job, taken away from some American, or else is on the relief rolls, taking relief that should go to the hungry wives and little children of American citizens.

And in addition to the 3,500,000 aliens here illegally—and in fact there are many more than that number here—there are about 6,500,000 aliens in the United States who came here lawfully but who have not thought enough of the

United States to take out their citizenship papers. And all of them either hold jobs, taken away from Americans, or else they are on our relief rolls being fed and warmed and housed and clothed by this Government, when there is not another country in the world that will do such things for aliens or allow them such privileges.

We must take steps at once to require all aliens to register, and we should immediately deport every alien here unlawfully, and we should deport all aliens who have been lawfully in the United States as long as 3 years who have not become naturalized citizens. If they are not willing to fight for our flag they should not be allowed to stay here.

This is America, not Russia. This is America, not Greece. This is America, not Italy. This is America, not Germany. This is America, not Hungary. This is America, not Czechoslovakia. This is America, not Poland. This is America, not Mexico. Yet you would not think so if you visited certain parts of our big cities, where aliens from these foreign countries speak here in their native tongues, read daily newspapers published in their native languages, maintain the customs and cook their foods as they did in their home countries.

CLEVELAND, OHIO, HAS 53 PUBLICATIONS PUBLISHED IN FOREIGN LANGUAGES

On one page of Cleveland's evening newspaper is a space edited by one of its reporters, Mr. Theodore Andrica, headed "Around the World in Cleveland", each numbered consecutively, and from its "No. 43" I quote the following:

CLEVELAND SECOND IN UNITED STATES IN NUMBER OF ITS FOREIGN-LANGUAGE PUBLICATIONS—53 MONTHLIES, WEEKLIES, AND DAILIES REPRESENT 13 NATIONALITIES

In no other American city except New York are there more foreign-language publications printed and edited than in Cleveland. To be exact, 53 foreign publications have their editorial and printing offices in Cleveland. Of these, 12 are dailies, 23 are weeklies, and 18 are monthlies.

Thirteen language groups are represented by these publications, namely: Czech, German, Hebrew, Hungarian, Italian, Lithuanian, Polish, Rumanian, Russian, Saxon, Serbian, Slovak, and Slovene.

Seven nationality groups have dailies here—the Bohemians, Germans, Hebrews, Hungarians, Italians, Poles, and Slovenes.

REACH ABOUT 150,000 DAILY

According to the publishers' sworn statements to the United States Post Office the total circulation of all the foreign-language dailies printed in Cleveland is between 100,000 and 150,000 daily.

The average size of a foreign language paper is 6 pages. On special occasions the edition contains as high as 40 pages. In most cases the publications are official organs of fraternal or religious organizations.

Of the 18 monthlies, 10 are of religious character. Of the 23 weeklies, 4 are religious and two-thirds of the others are organs of some fraternal groups.

The dailies print, besides current world news, much news of old country affairs or of world events with special bearing on their particular nationality.

Most of the dailies take a definite stand on old-country politics. The Socialists have 1 weekly, the Communists have 1 daily and 1 weekly, and the I. W. W. Party has 1 weekly and 1 monthly.

Is it not ridiculous to talk about deporting Communists when we allow Communists to publish daily Communist newspapers?

If aliens want to read here their daily newspaper published in foreign languages, they ought to go back to their own country and not steal jobs from Americans.

Now, I have a bill pending to stop all immigration for 10 years. That will give us a chance to assimilate the lawful aliens we already have in this country, millions of them, before we take on new ones. Are you in favor of that? If you are not in favor of it, of course, you will let things rock along, and if you are in favor of it, you will go up to the desk and sign a petition which I have placed there to take this bill away from the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization and take it up on the floor of this House and pass it. [Applause.]

We will not ever pass it in any other way. Chairman DICKSTEIN would not let us. He put my bill in his "dead-house" in the last Congress, and he has tried to do it again in this Congress.

As soon as he learned that I was going to file a petition to discharge his committee as to my bill he hurriedly called his committee together, and with a bare quorum present, he had my bill tabled, thinking that would prevent my filing the

discharge petition. But he was mistaken. That did not stop it. And I did file the petition.

If we can ever get it here on the floor of the House, we can pass this bill by a three-fourths vote. All we need is to get it on the floor and get it to a vote. All we need is to get it out of that committee. We must get it out of Chairman DICKSTEIN's "deadhouse." There is just one way on earth to get it out, and that is for 217 of you Members to sign the petition I have at the Clerk's desk.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BLANTON. Certainly; is the minority leader in favor of stopping immigration?

Mr. SNELL. I asked the gentleman if he would yield to me for a question.

Mr. BLANTON. I want to ask the gentleman a question first.

Mr. SNELL. The gentleman from Texas can ask me one afterward if he wants to.

Mr. BLANTON. I want to ask my question first; then I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SNELL. Then the gentleman need not yield if he does not want to yield. Afterward I will answer the gentleman's question.

Mr. BLANTON. I do not want to yield to the gentleman from New York unless he answers my question first.

Mr. SNELL. I will not answer.

Mr. BLANTON. Then I will not yield.

Mr. SNELL. I asked the gentleman a respectful question, if he would yield.

Mr. BLANTON. And I answered the gentleman in a respectful manner by asking him if the minority leader of this House was in favor of restricting immigration?

Mr. SNELL. I am not on the witness stand. If the gentleman does not want to yield to me, he does not have to.

Mr. BLANTON. Then I do not yield. Mr. Chairman, I do not yield to any man who is not willing to declare his position on such a vital question as this, a question that vitally affects the best interests of every family in the United States.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. BLANTON. In just a moment I will yield to my good friend from Kentucky. There is not a country of any size, except our own, on the face of the entire earth that will permit aliens to be employed when their nationals are out of employment. The United States of America is the only country that permits aliens to come here and take jobs away from our own Americans, and take the bread and meat out of the mouths of the wives and children of American workers and give it to foreigners.

Mr. Chairman, now I yield to my good friend the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY].

Mr. MAY. Has the gentleman read the bill I introduced in the House last week?

Mr. BLANTON. No; I regret I have not; but I know it is a good one. I am not talking about any bill except my own right at this moment, for it will stop all immigration. If the gentleman is in favor of stopping immigration, I have a petition on the Speaker's desk to discharge Chairman DICKSTEIN's committee, and will bring such a bill up and pass it. It will take it out of Chairman DICKSTEIN's "deadhouse." If you Members do not sign it, do not go home and tell your constituents that it is not your fault that immigration continues. When you go home this summer and they ask you why you did not stop immigration, do not tell them it is not your fault; tell them that you had a chance to sign a petition to discharge the committee so as to bring up a bill that would stop immigration for 10 years in this country, but that you sat in your seat and did not sign it.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; I yield to my friend from Mississippi.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON].

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman will remember that when we were passing the bill to reapportion Congress I tried to

get a provision included to exclude aliens from the count. That was defeated. Then we tried to have aliens who are unlawfully in the United States registered. Is there a provision in the gentleman's bill to require the registration of those aliens who are in the United States unlawfully? If not, the bill should be amended in this respect.

Mr. BLANTON. It ought to be so amended. It ought to require every alien in the United States to be registered; and it ought to require every alien who has been here 3 years without becoming naturalized to be deported to his home country. Then millions of aliens would be taken off the pay roll of this country and these jobs given to American heads of families. I had those provisions in another bill. I am centering my efforts just now to pass a bill that will stop all immigration for 10 years.

Mr. STACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I yield.

Mr. STACK. Does the gentleman from Texas consider the Irish as aliens?

Mr. BLANTON. I consider an alien any foreigner who is not a naturalized American. I consider every person who has come to this country and enjoyed its privileges and benefits but who has not thought enough of our flag to take out citizenship, an alien. You cannot make him fight to protect that flag; you cannot make him fight to protect America; and unless he can be made to share the responsibilities of citizenship he ought not to be allowed to take bread and meat away from real American citizens.

Mr. STACK. Now—

Mr. BLANTON. Is the gentleman heckling or is he trying to help?

Mr. STACK. No; the gentleman is not heckling.

Mr. BLANTON. All right, then.

Mr. STACK. On next Sunday we celebrate the 17th of March.

Mr. BLANTON. Is the gentleman in favor of restricting immigration? If he is, he should go up and sign that petition; if he is not, I ask him not to bother me.

Mr. STACK. I am not in favor of keeping out of the country people who have done good to the country.

Mr. BLANTON. Then if the gentleman is not in favor of restricting immigration, I cannot allow him to exhaust my time.

I believe that the people of the United States are in favor of preserving American jobs for Americans. If they are, they should let their wishes be known to the Members of this House who represent them, and if they would petition our Speaker, Hon. JOE BYRNS, of Tennessee, to do so, I feel sure he would permit this bill to stop immigration to be called up under suspension of the rules. That is one way to pass it.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MEAD].

Mr. MEAD. Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time in order that I might recommend to the Membership the necessity of this legislation, and particularly to favor the items in the bill for the Postal Service.

There is included in this deficiency appropriation bill \$3,000,000 for the operation of the Post Office Department. The Members of the House will recall that when the Post Office-Treasury appropriation bill was under consideration I recommended and the House approved three amendments totaling approximately \$3,000,000 additional for the conduct of the Post Office Department. The Post Office Department now comes before the Appropriations Committee and requests an additional \$2,500,000 for the operation of the Department for the balance of the present fiscal year.

This is necessary because of the increased volume of postal business and also because of the fact that no item was contained in the bill last year to cover the expenses incident to the added cost of the night-differential pay. The point I want to make at this time is that the increased volume of business in the Postal Service necessitates the increased postal appropriation.

Mr. ARNOLD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEAD. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ARNOLD. The gentleman is aware of the fact that the additional amount carried in this bill is not due to the increased business in the Postal Service. It is due entirely to the fact that in the estimates that were submitted for the 1935 appropriation bill the matter of money for the night differential was entirely overlooked, and the items carried in this bill are to cover that oversight in the 1935 bill. So far as the 1936 bill that we just had before us a few days ago is concerned, we could not carry that money to pay for the night differential in the 1935 bill without making it immediately available, and that was not done.

Mr. MEAD. The specific reason for this request is due to the omission of the night-differential item in the last appropriation bill; but the gentleman knows that the Post Office Department has paid the night differential from the beginning of the present fiscal year up to now, and that this appropriation for \$2,500,000 for clerical hire and \$500,000 for the carrier hire will not be necessary for the remaining months of this fiscal year for the night differential alone. He also knows that the Post Office Department has the right to transfer funds from one item to another up to approximately 12 percent. However, the gentleman probably does not know that the real reason for this deficiency appropriation is because of the exhaustion of funds for auxiliary hire, due to an increase in postal volume, and that this money will be used to a large extent in defraying the expenses resulting from the increased postal volume. This appropriation is vitally necessary for the conduct of the Post Office Department for the remainder of the fiscal year. It is regrettable that this item was overlooked a year ago and that an appropriation for approximately \$2,500,000 was not contained in the bill. If that had happened, I may say to the gentleman, an order which was issued by the Post Office Department governing all post offices throughout the United States for the last quarter of a year would not have been issued. This order restricts postmasters in the use of appropriations for auxiliary hire, and it has resulted, and will result unless this appropriation is passed by the House and Senate, in a drastic curtailment of the service and the impoverishment of substitutes in the Service. I may say to the gentleman further that the Acting Director of the Budget, in his letter to the President, makes the following statement:

In preparing the estimates for the above two appropriations for the fiscal year 1935, the Post Office Department states that through inadvertence no amounts were included to cover the item of 10 percent additional pay authorized by law for night work, and that such omissions were not detected until recently. Also the volume of postal business for this fiscal year has greatly exceeded that anticipated at the time the Budget for 1935 was submitted, which necessitated additional expenditures for auxiliary service. The amounts requested are necessary to provide additional funds to meet the requirements of the Postal Service under these heads for the current fiscal year.

Mr. ARNOLD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEAD. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ARNOLD. Of course, the gentleman understands that by the increase in the Postal Service requiring funds that had been appropriated in the 1935 bill, it did not leave sufficient funds that they could make a transfer to pay for this night differential?

Mr. MEAD. Correct.

Mr. ARNOLD. But the money that is carried in this emergency bill is for the purpose of paying that night differential on those two items?

Mr. MEAD. The gentleman is approximately correct. When this money is available the Post Office Department will be able to return that amount which has been used up to the present time in defraying the added expense resulting from the increased night differential to the clerical and carrier funds. This transfer of funds will take care of the auxiliary service until the end of the present fiscal year. The gentleman and I are in agreement, and I merely want to bring out the point that when the appropriation bill was being considered on the floor of the House I asked for

an additional million dollars for auxiliary hire for the carrier service, for an additional million dollars for auxiliary hire in the clerical service, and for \$900,000 for payment of the travel allowance which will be due to the employees of the Railway Mail Service.

Mr. Chairman, I want to point out that the auxiliary service is the service that has suffered. No one who is employed after 6 o'clock at night and before 6 o'clock in the morning has suffered, because he has received, up to date, his full night-differential pay; but the substitutes in the carrier and clerical service have suffered, and the postal patrons have suffered. That is what I had in mind when I suggested and the House approved the amendments which I presented to the Committee of the Whole when the postal appropriation bill was under consideration.

Mr. HAMLIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEAD. I yield to the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. HAMLIN. May I ask if under this additional appropriation probably some of it will be employed in the stopping of consolidations of some of the postal rural routes? I am receiving a great number of letters from Maine relative to that matter, and I am today going to the postal authorities in reference to same. Rural routes are being combined with the object in view of saving money and these routes should not be combined. I am in favor of allowing more money for many of these rural routes so that they will not have to be combined.

Mr. MEAD. I may say to the gentleman that unfortunately no part of this money will be used for the purpose mentioned.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. Chairman, in conclusion I want to make the point that the postal appropriations contained in this bill are worthy of your consideration and support. They will make possible an extension of the service where curtailment has already taken place in the offices of the first and second class.

They will also provide postal substitutes with an opportunity to earn a living wage between now and the end of this fiscal year, and in this connection I offer as an exhibit with respect to substitute salaries, the salaries being paid at the Dayton, Ohio, office.

DAYTON, OHIO

Twenty-six substitutes, July 1933 to November 1934

Month	Salary, per month	Number of hours
1933		
July.....	\$19.25	36
August.....	14.60	27
September.....	23.28	44
October.....	25.79	48
November.....	21.42	40
December.....	77.96	147
1934		
January.....	19.64	37
February.....	21.25	40
March.....	8.92	16
April.....	7.88	13
May.....	70.20	118
June.....	58.10	98
July.....	51.97	87
August.....	52.00	86
September.....	65.25	109
October.....	57.50	96
November.....	43.50	74
Total average salary.....	37.56	1,116

NOTE.—The above figures are averages per man.

In July 1933 the average pay of a substitute was \$19.25. In January 1934 it was \$19.64.

Since the curtailment order was sent out, the salaries have dropped to but a few dollars a week, and in November of 1934, before the curtailment order went out, they were only averaging \$43.50 a month.

This is a fair example of the pay received by substitutes in every section of the country.

The Department's order makes it compulsory on the part of the postmaster to eliminate nearly all auxiliary hire until this money is available. Therefore, for the expansion of the service and for proper pay for postal substitutes, I hope that both of these items meet with your approval.

UNDERMANNED POSTAL SERVICE

Early in February the Post Office Department instructed postmasters that in order to stay within the appropriations available it was necessary to appeal again to all postmasters to reduce expenditures for auxiliary and overtime for the remainder of the fiscal year and to confine the estimates for auxiliary and overtime for the June quarter to the very minimum without curtailing the service. Postmasters were also informed that no expenditures "over the amount allowed could be made without authority from the Department under the penalty of the postmaster being held personally responsible for the excess expenditure."

In November 1934 the Department announced the appointment of a considerable number of additional employees to fill existing vacancies, and it was anticipated at that time that the Department would very shortly give consideration to appointing additional employees wherever it was shown that an 8-hour-day route or tenure of duty was in operation. This has not been done, as in the latter part of December the Department suddenly discontinued the filling of all vacancies on the ground that their appropriation had been almost exhausted. As a result of this policy and the letter of the early part of February already referred to, many postmasters immediately began to inaugurate a curtailed service in their cities by cutting down, and in many cases, eliminating entirely the work of the substitute. There are a large number of cases throughout the country where substitute carriers have been working on an auxiliary 8-hour route for a long time, and these men, because of lack of funds, have been prevented from securing a justified promotion to a regular position. In some cases where postmasters have requested the appointment of additional carriers, the cases were referred to post-office inspectors for investigation, who made a full and complete investigation of the conditions existing in these cities, and who before leaving informed the postmasters that they were going to concur in his recommendation for additional employees, and in some cases postmasters were told that the inspector intended to recommend additional employees above those recommended by the postmaster.

Mr. Ambrose O'Connell, executive assistant to the Postmaster General, in a radio address of March 1, stated that postal receipts had shown a decided increase during the current fiscal year and were still on the way up. Mr. O'Connell stated:

For the first 7 months of this fiscal year ending January 21, 1935, the Post Office Department has collected \$22,000,000 in excess of the collection for the same period last year. This is a notable increase, and the steady expansion indicates the need of additional employees to care for this increase in business.

With respect to the message from the Bureau of the Budget—House Document No. 131—requesting a deficiency appropriation of \$2,500,000 for clerk and \$500,000 for carrier hire, this relates directly to my presentation of conditions on the floor of the House on February 1, at which time we secured an increase in appropriations of \$1,000,000 each for clerk and carrier hire during 1935.

The Post Office Department is withholding some 995 vacancies in many of which substitutes are employed for a full 8 hours per day.

This is an evasion of the salary laws in that the Department is securing work for \$1,400 for which it should pay at the rate of \$2,100 per year.

The Department, in its testimony before the House Appropriations Committee, stated that the substitutes generally were "doing quite well, indeed."

Almost coincident with this testimony bitter complaints appeared from throughout the entire country as to drastic curtailments of substitute employment.

The Department's statement in response to these complaints was that the auxiliary funds had been exhausted or

dangerously depleted in many offices and that in order to stay within the Budget for the year 1935 no extra allowances could be given postmasters. It was stated, however, that these economies must be effected without curtailment of the service.

With the regular forces depleted by failure to fill vacancies, as evidenced by the Department's own testimony, such reductions in auxiliary employment of substitutes could not occur without detriment to the Service. That this did occur is amply demonstrated by the reports coming in from all section of the United States.

Responses from 1,513 substitutes disclosed their average period of service as 6 years and 6 months. A number of these reports state that regular clerks are being worked overtime while substitutes are remaining idle. The regular clerk of the \$2,100 grade, and practically all of them are now in that grade, gets 86 cents an hour for overtime. If he works between the hours of 6 p. m. and 6 a. m. he gets 8 cents additional, or 94 cents an hour. A substitute gets 61.75 cents an hour under the 5-percent pay reduction now in effect.

It was in response to complaints such as those above stated that the request for a deficiency appropriation undoubtedly had its origin.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FERGUSON].

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. Chairman, at this place I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a bill introduced by myself (H. R. 6455) proposing the creation of a permanent Department of Soil Erosion.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

The bill is as follows:

A bill to provide for the control of flood waters in the United States by creating a permanent Soil Erosion Service

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purpose of controlling floods in navigable waters, and of protecting agricultural lands in the United States, the Soil Erosion Service established in the Department of the Interior under the authority of title II of the National Industrial Recovery Act is hereby made a permanent agency in that Department.

SEC. 2. Out of any moneys appropriated and subject to allotment for such purposes, an amount not less than \$50,000,000 shall be allotted to the Soil Erosion Service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1936, for the purposes of this act.

SEC. 3. The Soil Erosion Service is authorized to coordinate all activities relating to the prevention of soil erosion carried on by any agency of the Government; to secure, from any agency of the Government, such information and services as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act; and to secure the consent of any such agency to carry on erosion-prevention work on lands under the jurisdiction of such agency.

SEC. 4. It shall be the duty of the Soil Erosion Service—

(a) To complete the erosion-prevention projects already undertaken by it and to establish other projects in areas suffering from wind and water erosion so situated as to provide, in as many such areas as possible, demonstrations of the methods of erosion prevention;

(b) To disseminate information, by printed matter and otherwise, concerning the methods of erosion prevention;

(c) To include, in the activities herein authorized, adequate provision for the prevention of wind erosion, as well as erosion by water; and

(d) To conduct research pertaining to the prevention of erosion.

SEC. 5. In connection with any erosion-prevention work on private lands, the Secretary of the Interior may enter into such agreements with farmers and other persons as he may deem necessary to carry out the purposes of this act. Such agreements may include provisions for contributions to the erosion-prevention work by the Soil Erosion Service and by any other party to the agreement in the form of labor, equipment, materials, seed, fertilizer, and otherwise, and may impose permanent or temporary limitations on the use of the land.

SEC. 6. For the purposes of this act, the Secretary of the Interior, through the Soil Erosion Service, may—

(a) Prescribe such regulations as he may deem necessary.

(b) Without regard to the civil-service laws or the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, appoint and fix the compensation of such officers and employees as he may deem necessary, and may enter into arrangements with any educational or research institution for the employment and compensation of any person of specialized knowledge or experience jointly by the Soil Erosion Service and such institution.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. Chairman, not very many days ago I called the attention of this House to the destructive effect of winds in the western part of the United States.

This whole problem of soil erosion has faced almost every nation in history. The problem of maintaining the soil at a degree of productivity is one that is so closely aligned with the political and economic future of the country that unless a nation gives it grave consideration and takes steps to take care of its soil, that nation will not exist very long. To speak of a nation that most of us are familiar with, you will find in the Old Testament of the Bible many references made to trees and groves and pastures as landmarks and part of the social well being of those people. By the time the New Testament was written there are practically no references made to certain trees that were mentioned just a few generations before, because those people had not taken stock and had not cared for their land and after they were invaded by foreign enemies the productivity of their land, as well as their civilization, was practically ruined. We find the same thing happened in Egypt, one of the great nations of the world which was destroyed because foreign conquerors came in and destroyed the works that made it possible for that nation to exist.

At last this country has taken a definite step in attacking the problem of soil erosion. Last year out of P. W. A. funds, \$14,000,000 was appropriated for the establishment of a permanent Soil Erosion Service under the Department of the Interior. This Department, in an experimental way, has accomplished a great deal. It has established some 54 camps over the United States. You can see from this map that they are widely distributed and in various types of soil.

I have introduced a bill, which I have had placed in the RECORD, which provides that this Soil Erosion Service shall be made a permanent department of the Government.

When the Government engineers consider any projects they always work out the economic justification for them. When you figure that the annual loss to the farmers of this country from soil erosion can be conservatively estimated at \$400,000,000, you will realize that any program undertaken would be economically justified.

When we figure that a good portion of the legislation enacted in the last 2 years has been financed by bonds that must be paid by wealth produced from the soil, we certainly must take the attitude that nothing must stand in the way of preserving the productivity of this soil for future generations.

If we have established the fact that it is justified and something must be done, we always meet the question of what can be accomplished. We hear a great many people say that the wind has always existed, the water has always washed the soil away, what can we do to stop it. No single mechanical means will stop it. Terracing is a contributing factor when it is scientifically done, but it must be a long-term, educational program, and the beautiful thing about the work undertaken by the Soil Erosion Service is they did not have to put out propaganda to sell the farmers. They did not have to make a great effort to sell them on the idea. They have gone to these communities where an area is to be affected by a soil-conservation project and 90 percent of the farmers have signed up voluntarily to go into a program that will show them how they can save their soil for future generations.

I have in my district not less than half a dozen areas affecting from 20,000 to 120,000 acres, where as many as 3,000 farmers have signed a petition to have the Government come in and help them solve this problem. They know if it is not solved they cannot earn a livelihood on these farms. It is a beautiful thing, in this time of having to sell ideas, to have one program that the farmers and the people who are interested are asking for whole-heartedly, and they are willing to accept obligations to have it carried out.

The district I represent is composed of 12 counties; all 12 counties have petitioned the Soil Erosion Service to aid them in combating the problems of soil erosion.

I have before me a letter from Dr. N. E. Winters, regional director of the Soil Erosion Service at Stillwater. He said the following men were in his office on February 14 discussing the possibility of starting a watershed on the Chikaskia River. I read the names to show you that the men interested

are not only farmers but professional and business men of that community that realize the importance of this program to save the soil: Mr. Roy S. Johnson, chairman of the committee; Mr. L. F. Carroll, farmer, of Newkirk, Okla.; Mr. J. S. Clark, county engineer, Newkirk; Mr. W. R. Hutchinson, county agent, Newkirk; Mr. R. N. Wall, vocational agriculture instructor, Ponca City, Okla.; Mr. W. C. Baum, farmer and county commissioner, Kaw City, Okla.; Mr. E. L. Waldo, Governor Marland's chairman for Kay County; Mr. V. O. Hayes, Blackwell, Okla.; and Mr. Sam Hendershot, farmer, of Eddy.

In connection with this, I also have before me a petition, signed by Mr. Chester C. Smith, county commissioner of Garfield County, Okla., and signed by 67 farmers of the Covington community, making application to establish a Soil Erosion Service there.

Letters come in daily from Cimarron, Beaver, Texas, Woodward, Woods, Alfalfa, Nobel, Kay, Major, Grant, and Harper Counties asking my aid to secure this much-needed work for their particular areas.

Under the program conducted by the Soil Erosion Service they go to a farmer and ask his cooperation. Then a trained man goes to the farmer, after mapping out the farm, makes suggestions as to what part of his farm is eroded beyond further use and what crops will keep his farm from further erosion. He plans a scientific method and an approach that includes even the running of an embankment on this pasture land to keep the water from running off more than it otherwise would.

The farmers have gone into a cooperative agreement with the Soil Erosion Service to help them in starting this work and keeping it up even after the Soil Erosion Service is through.

I had the pleasure of spending 3 days at the Stillwater project, and the spirit of that community and the men carrying on this work is like that of the crusaders. They know that the future welfare of the country depends on the preservation of the soil for future generations. You say it is a slow process, one that has been going on for years, but in many instances we have lost as much as 5 inches of new topsoil in the West during one season of sandstorms—material that nature required 5,000 years to build.

I have before me some figures gathered by Dr. N. E. Winters. He says:

Seventy-five percent of our cultivated fields are sloping enough to suffer serious soil losses from uncontrolled run-off rain water. Over 2,000,000 acres in the United States are annually planted to clean-cultivated crops such as corn, cotton, and tobacco, and a large percentage of this is left bare without surface vegetation cover to protect the surface soil from erosion. Most of the top soil has been washed away from 125,000,000 acres of our cultivated fields. That top soil of 12 to 18 inches in depth, which required for its development several thousand years, that part which contains the organic matter and most of the soluble plant food for crop production, is now gone from 125,000,000 acres, down our creeks and rivers, and some of it clear into the ocean.

Do you remember a few days ago when we had that severe duststorm here in Washington, Mr. Bennett reported it to be the dirt caused by the storms that originated in Oklahoma and Kansas?

Another practice that is helping to ruin lands is the annual burning of pastures. On this the Soil Erosion Experiment Station has made an experiment along that line, and the results give vividly the effect of this custom on the annual losses of soil and water. Following is a chart resulting from these experiments:

Effect of burning pastures and woods on soil and water losses annually

	5 run-off	Tons per acre soil loss
Virgin woods.....	0.13	0.017
Woods burned once each year.....	4.96	.223

Burning the woods and pastures each year multiplies the loss of run-off water by 38 and the loss of soil by 13.

Are we going to continue to accept this problem of soil erosion as something minor? Are we going to let the wind

and water destroy the future prosperity of this Nation? Or are we going to tackle this problem and give the Soil Erosion Service the necessary funds to carry on this work in order that the future of this country will be insured.

The Soil Erosion Service has planned a long-time program. It is only through a long-time program that we can combat this evil. I will take this opportunity to read you a letter from Dr. Bennett, of the Soil Erosion Service, that deals with the problem of a national plan of saving the soil and the problems that confront Oklahoma.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
SOIL EROSION SERVICE,
Washington, March 4, 1935.

HON. PHIL FERGUSON,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. FERGUSON: By special messenger I am sending you a map showing the distribution of our major erosion projects along with a statement giving the number of acres involved in each and the allotments to each of these projects, together with funds used for administrative expenses and other studies and cooperative arrangements with other Government agencies.

You will note that in the western grazing regions very large areas are involved. This does not mean that we will work over the entire area, but that we will work on the critical parts of these areas such as are involved with their stabilization in the interest of the irrigation civilization dependent on these areas and the very life of the Navajo Indians.

This map shows also the location of the present 51 E. C. W. camps which have been allotted to us by Mr. Fechner, of Emergency Conservation Work. We are using these camps pretty largely for gully-control work, the construction of terrace outlets, and in some localities for the mining of limestone needed for correcting the acidity of the land so that it will produce soil-holding legumes. We could use many more E. C. W. camps to supplement our erosion projects. I think there are in the neighborhood of 200 E. C. W. camps working on erosion problems involved with agricultural lands, but most of these have been assigned to the Forest Service.

With reference to the possibilities of expansion of our program, I can only say that the possibilities are enormous. Of course, no program should be extended faster than adequate technical personnel can be trained to look after the projects, but the Soil Erosion Service is in a position to train very rapidly large numbers of men. As a matter of fact, we have something like a thousand trainees now on our rolls, and among them there will be many competent men. These trainees learn the whole erosion program by working from the very bottom (in the bottom of gullies) on up to the more intricate matter of the installation of the various protective devices employed in controlling erosion in fields and also in assisting with the making of necessary maps of farms.

It is my feeling that we should have many more demonstration areas comprising smaller acreages and that these should be so distributed as to be within reasonable distance of the farmers of the surrounding localities. There will be need also for additional large watershed projects, and I should think from these centers, where we have demonstrated to the farmers that it is practical enormously to reduce the evils of erosion to spread out to all lands needing treatment through cooperative arrangements with the Extension Service, the colleges of agriculture, and other pertinent organizations.

We cannot develop immediately the location of all these projects. It will take serious study and a good deal of time. However, we are working on them and will soon have much additional information.

I trust this will be helpful to you in connection with your plans.

Very truly yours,

H. H. BENNETT, Director.

Soil erosion control projects

Project no.	Name of project	Regional director	Office location	Approximate acres	Appropriations
1	Coon Creek.....	R. H. Davis..	La Crosse, Wis..	93,000	\$360,000
2	West Tarkio River	R. E. Uhland..	Bethany, Mo....	104,000	800,000
3	Big Creek.....			186,000	
4	Sangamon River..	F. A. Fisher..	Urbana, Ill.....	133,000	500,000
5	Elm Creek.....	H. V. Geib....	Temple, Tex.....	207,000	350,000
	South Tyger River	T. S. Buile....	Spartanburg, S. C.	111,000	575,000
6	Wildhorse Creek..	W. A. Rockie..	Pullman, Wash..	32,000	420,000
	South Palouse River			98,000	
7	Arroyo Las Posas..	H. E. Reddick..	Santa Paula, Calif.	45,000	325,000
	Arroyo Grande....			7,000	
9	Stillwater Creek..	N. E. Winters..	Stillwater, Okla.	177,000	410,000
10	Navajo.....	H. G. Calkins..	Albuquerque, N. Mex.	16,000,000	1,600,000
11	Limestone Creek..	F. L. Duley....	Mankato, Kans..	114,000	375,000
12	Deep River.....	J. H. Stallings..	High Point, N. C.	139,000	750,000
	Brown Creek.....			60,000	
13	Reedy Creek.....	J. S. Cutler, acting.	Spencer, W. Va.	87,000	385,000
14	Salt Creek.....	J. S. Cutler, acting.	Zanesville, Ohio.	93,000	440,000
	Cooley Creek.....	H. M. Mims, acting.	Minden, La.....	55,000	500,000
15	Cypress Creek.....			45,000	

Soil erosion control projects—Continued

Project no.	Name of project	Regional director	Office location	Approximate acres	Appropriations
16	Plum Creek.....	H. L. von Trebra.	Albion, Nebr....	70,000	295,000
17	East Cadron Creek.	Fred C. Newport.	Conway, Ark....	116,000	320,000
18	Buck and Sandy Creeks.	R. Y. Bailey..	Dadeville, Ala..	116,000	325,000
19	Sandy Creek.....	Loy E. Rast..	Athens, Ga.....	107,000	400,000
20	Duck Creek.....	L. P. Merrill..	Lindale, Tex....	25,000	175,000
21	Okatibbee River...	C. B. Anders..	Meridian, Miss..	144,000	420,000
22	Banister River....	P. F. Keil.....	Chatham, Va.....	146,000	550,000
23	Sandy River, Va....			29,000	
24	Soil-erosion survey do.....	A. L. Patrick..	State College, Pa.		58,200
25	Gila River.....	F. B. Howe....	Ithaca, N. Y.....		90,000
26	Root River, Minn..	B. P. Fleming..	Safford, Ariz....	12,000,000	505,000
27	Dalhart area.....	R. H. Davis....	La Crosse, Wis..	190,000	238,000
28	Reedy Fork.....	H. H. Finnell..	Dalhart, Tex....	126,000	85,000
		J. H. Stallings.	Greensboro, N. C.	48,000	150,000
29	Crooked Creek.....	A. L. Patrick..	Indiana, Pa.....	135,000	191,800
30	Fishing Creek.....	T. S. Buile....	Rock Hill, S. C..	52,000	150,000
31	Corralitos.....	H. E. Reddick..	Watsonville, Calif.	68,000	200,000
32	Raritan River.....	L. L. Lee.....	New Brunswick, N. J.	37,000	200,000
33	Shue Creek.....	H. J. Clemmer..	Huron, S. Dak....	142,000	125,000
34	Wolsey area.....			38,000	
	Rio Grande.....	H. G. Calkins..	Albuquerque, N. Mex.	11,500,000	200,000
35	Crowleys Ridge...	F. C. Newport..	Forrest City, Ark.	32,000	125,000
36	Cohocton River...	F. B. Howe....	Bath, N. Y.....	150,000	135,000
37	Muckalee Creek...	Loy E. Rast..	Americus, Ga....	25,000	150,000
38	Pecan Creek.....	N. E. Winters..	Muskogee, Okla.	37,000	150,000
39	Black Squirrel Creek.	A. E. McClymonds.	Colorado Springs, Colo.	159,000	125,000
	Smoky Hill River.			169,000	

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
SOIL EROSION SERVICE,
Washington, February 27, 1935.

Hon. PHIL FERGUSON,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. FERGUSON: In reply to your personal request of yesterday I am submitting herewith a general statement entitled "The Problem of Water and Soil Conservation", which briefly covers the national problem of erosion, the program of the Soil Erosion Service (beginning on p. 10) and a résumé of some of the more important accomplishments on the crop lands (beginning on p. 16), but not covering accomplishments on the large projects of the western grazing areas. Here is also a more comprehensive paper on wind erosion under the title, "Prevention and Control of Wind Erosion of High Plain Soils in the Panhandle Country", by Mr. H. H. Finnell; and a brief statement with respect to erosion in Oklahoma.

You understand, of course, that we are working with \$14,000,000 allotted to the Service by the Public Works Administration. This has been apportioned to the 40 projects distributed throughout the country, 2 of which are in Oklahoma.

As in the instance of many other States, we have received applications for additional projects for various parts of Oklahoma. One came in recently for a project in Grady County in the Little Washita Basin, endorsed by the names of 3,200 farmers and land-owners; another from Custer and Washita Counties for a project on the watershed of Turkey Creek, endorsed by approximately 1,000 people; and still another from Custer and Caddo Counties for a project on the watershed of Little Deer Creek with a similar heavy endorsement. These requests mean, as I construe them, that the people have been convinced of the efficacy of the program now being carried on in Oklahoma under the Soil Erosion Service and that they have been awakened to the need for extending the work to other areas. This same situation applies to other erosive lands in numerous parts of the country, that is to say, the people concerned are continuously and urgently requesting expansion of the program. Unquestionably this situation would not exist if these people did not earnestly desire this work in their localities, believing it to be the only way out of a problem which involves the saving of their indispensable agricultural lands.

Very truly yours,

H. H. BENNETT, Director.

EROSION PROBLEM OF OKLAHOMA BRIEFLY STATED

Oklahoma is one of the States where erosion constitutes the major economic problem confronting the people. It is estimated, on the basis of erosion surveys and measurements of the rates of soil removed by erosion, that in the neighborhood of 440,000,000 tons of soil are washed or blown out of the fields and pastures of the State every year. This is the equivalent of 1,300 farms of 160 acres each, having a depth of 12 inches of predominately rich soil material. A recently completed erosion survey of the State shows that approximately 28,000,000 acres of land of all classes are suffering seriously from wind and water erosion. Of this, about 13,000,000 acres have reached the stage of serious gullying. Something over 2,000,000 acres have been essentially destroyed. No State, community, or business could long withstand any such losses.

The Soil Erosion Service of the Department of the Interior is now carrying on two large demonstrations of practical erosion control in Oklahoma, one in the watershed of Stillwater Creek, near Stillwater, comprising 150,000 acres, and the other in the watershed of Pecan Creek, near Muskogee, comprising 40,000 acres. As rapidly as possible all erosive land within these watersheds will be treated, in accordance with the specific needs and adaptabilities of the different kinds of land, with proven practical measures of control. Already much progress has been made on the Stillwater Creek project, enough to convince those who have studied the program that this is the only practical plan by which permanent erosion control can be effected.

Obviously two demonstrations are not enough to solve the problem for a large State like Oklahoma, so seriously affected as it is. At present nothing is being done in connection with wind-erosion control in the State, although the survey referred to shows that something over 4,000,000 acres of land have already been severely damaged by wind, and that the evil is spreading to other productive areas. The physical facts involved show that there should be additional water-erosion demonstrations of the type now being carried on near Stillwater, and wind-erosion demonstrations of the type being carried on in the vicinity of Dalhart, Tex., in sufficient number to serve the various definite regions of the State, such as are determined by soil character, type of agriculture, and climatic conditions.

In connection with the problem of erosion by water, the fact should not be lost sight of that it will never be possible to bring about anything approximating permanent effective flood control until erosion is taken care of from the very crests of watersheds down to the stream channels. Erosion is the product of accelerated run-off of water, following removal of the stabilizing cover of vegetation, as trees, grass, and shrubs, and cultivation or overgrazing of ranges and pastures. Erosion control means reduction of the run-off and that, of course, means the reduction of the hazard of floods and, incidentally, the reduction of the hazard of the silting of stream channels and the covering of valuable bottom lands and lower slopes with infertile material washed down from higher lands.

In conclusion may I call attention that in order for this program to be successful it must be carried out over a period of years—not 5, 10, but 20 years. We have been letting our soils go to ruination for the past 50 years; surely we could not expect to restore our eroded lands to normal in a period of 12 months.

It must be remembered that we first must work on the soils that are still producing. Saving these soils first, then treating the lands that have eroded beyond immediate productivity by letting them heal themselves. Nature will cure her soil by just helping her along a little. By this I mean building baffles, reseeding, and keeping out livestock on this land that is so completely eroded.

I sincerely hope that the Soil Erosion Service will be allowed enough camps to carry on this work. These camps are manned by a staff of technically trained men that really accomplish their goal. It is really a pleasure to see them in action. The Government can well be proud of their soil-erosion camps.

WIND EROSION

As to the practical prevention of wind erosion, according to the program of the Soil Erosion Service, I note the following:

The intense dust storms that recently have been sweeping across the Midwest is a grim object lesson of the destructive power of wind erosion and a graphic illustration of the imperative need for its control. Continued storms of this sort can be expected until adequate steps to prevent their recurrence are taken by farmers in the Great Plains region, where improper farming methods and cultivation of certain exceptionally vulnerable soils make soil blowing a constant menace.

The significance of these recent dust storms is appalling. They mean that our conquest of America has been achieved at reckless cost in land resources. We have dealt heedlessly with our land, and have done virtually nothing to control wind erosion. Now we are threatened with a situation comparable to the "dark sea" off the north coast of Africa, where at frequent intervals sirocco dust storms originating in the Sahara have blotted out the sun and scattered desert-derived soil material over large parts of Europe.

In the dim ages of the past, vast areas of loessial soils were built up over northwestern China, composed of dust borne by wind from the Gobi Desert. Similarly, before the dawn of history, loessial soils of large content were formed

along the lower Mississippi River, in the valley of the Missouri, in the Palouse Belt of Washington, Idaho, and Oregon, and in other parts of the United States. Nothing is known of the precise conditions that caused the deposition of these great areas of wind-blown soils; their origin is rooted in the remote past.

But we do know the cause of these recent dust storms in the United States. We know definitely that they are taking place because of land misuse and failure to provide adequate protection of cultivated areas in the country west of the Mississippi. About 15 to 30 years of cultivation were required to make the soil of this region susceptible to rapid blowing into the high passageways of wind. Depletion of the soil-binding humus resulting from oxidation that goes with cultivation and the gradual blowing that follows the breaking up of ground cover of native grass have finally left the soil in a powdery condition favoring easy movement by wind. In some fields as much as 16 inches of soil and subsoil have blown away during the past 18 months. Once started, wind erosion proceeds even faster than water erosion.

Approximately 60,000,000 acres of land in the subhumid and semiarid regions of the United States have suffered severe damage from wind erosion, according to a recent survey by the Soil Erosion Service. About 5,000,000 acres have been essentially destroyed for any possible cropping purposes by the loss of topsoil or by the deposition of wind-blown sand on fertile areas.

Results of a Nation-wide reconnaissance survey of erosion conditions show that in Oklahoma more than 4,000,000 acres of once fertile country have been severely damaged by wind erosion. In South Dakota about 4,000,000 acres are in a serious condition. Eight million acres in Texas, largely in the Panhandle, have been seriously injured and in some cases essentially ruined for cultivation. In Montana about 3,000,000 acres are in a serious condition. In Colorado 9,000,000 acres have suffered severe damage. Six million acres have been affected to a serious degree in Kansas, with nearly 800,000 acres completely destroyed. In all of these States much greater areas have been moderately affected or are being threatened with danger.

Dust storms can be averted to a large extent by the maintenance of an adequate cover of vegetation on the ground and by scientific and practical methods of cultivation.

In the vicinity of Dalhart, Tex., in the Panhandle region where wind erosion has been so serious, the Soil Erosion Service is now conducting a demonstration of the most effective measures of wind-erosion control. Similar projects are getting under way in eastern Colorado and central South Dakota.

Among the measures of control being applied by the Soil Erosion Service in its wind-erosion control areas are:

Restocking the more erosive areas with some adaptable type of vegetation and treating other areas with strips of tall, wind-resistant crops, such as sorghum; planting shrubs and trees in critical positions; plowing the land in furrows more or less at right angles to the direction of prevailing wind; plowing up of clay subsoil and leaving bare land in a cloddy condition; building embankments or a specialized type of terrace along the contours of the land to intercept and hold rain water; strip cropping with grass; and leaving on the land as much stubble vegetation as possible.

At this point I wish to insert a letter from Mr. H. H. Finnell, of the Dalhart, Tex., station.

DALHART, TEX., February 25, 1935.

MR. G. A. BARNES,
Soil Erosion Service, Twelfth and Constitution,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BARNES: I made a thorough inspection of our project area this morning to observe the results of the severe 3-day storm of February 22 to 24, inclusive. I am happy to report that none of our field work was damaged where it had been completed and that very little damage is apparent on incomplete jobs. Where overgrazing has been prevented in wheat fields and moisture conservation accomplished there was little damage to wheat, but a considerable area of wheat on high and sloping lands was blown out, as a result of insufficient moisture to produce an effective ground covering. Where crop residues had been conserved according to our plan there is no erosion injury whatever.

On the other hand, on much land which was abandoned last year and on which no effort has been made to recondition in preparation for the spring winds and crop planting the hummocks are piled higher than ever. It is this neglected area which gives rise to the big dust clouds traveling great distances across the country. However, I may say that the formation of high dust clouds are not always coincidental with the most severe wind erosion. It is a particular meteorological condition involving rising air currents which cause the formation of the far-traveling dust clouds. For example, the day the dust cloud reached Dalhart the average wind velocity was only 12.3 miles per hour, but it increased to 23.1 miles per hour for the 24 hours ending this morning at 7 a. m. After the passing of the storm front a straight low-sweeping wind developed and this did most of the damage experienced at this point. No dust was carried high into the air but the drifting of soil from exposed areas was very acute, blocking railways, highways, blowing away fences, and building new drifts wherever tumble weeds found lodgment.

Yours very truly,

H. H. FINNELL.

Since the Soil Erosion Service estimates 34,000,000 acres are being seriously affected in 6 western States by wind erosion, this problem does not lend itself to the program undertaken by the Soil Erosion Service drainage basins, and so forth.

This is a huge emergency program in a country where many of the farmers are facing their third and fourth crop failure. If all the contracted wheat land that is suffering from erosion as well as wheat land that has been "blown out" for this year's crop could be prepared in a manner recommended by the Soil Erosion Service and planted to the proper erosion-resisting crops, it would go a long way toward solving the problem.

These farmers must have money advanced for seed and fuel; they in turn should agree to keep such land out of productivity for a long enough time to give the ground a chance to be healed by nature. Such a program would cost millions, but it would allow farmers work at home instead of on relief, and pay dividends a hundred fold by maintaining the future productivity of the land and preventing the fields from blowing out and ruining the adjacent land.

Every service of the Government, the county agents, the extension division, the agricultural college, and so forth, should be called in to aid in this big fight. A fight to preserve the very existence of what was once the greatest wheat-producing area in the world.

MR. BACON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [MR. HOFFMAN].

MR. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, using the vehicle of everyone's desire to protect the small investor from loss, to curb greed, and prevent the unfair accumulation of vast wealth by improper means, our President yesterday sent to the Congress a message which deserves the deepest consideration of every Member of the House.

Writing yesterday, as so frequently, in the interest of those who have been wronged, those interested in public-utility holding companies were taken sharply to task for their efforts to influence Members of Congress through propaganda coming from the home folks.

Always an admirer of the great Roosevelt, whose uncompromising fight for the things he believed to be right and for the interests of his countrymen earned for him not only popular acclaim but the deepest love and affection, many of us recall the great and incomparable Teddy, whose words, if not actions, the present occupant of the White House sometimes follows and hoped that his statements of policy might, as were Teddy's, be followed by action giving them effect.

Another Roosevelt has come to power, swept to the highest office in the gift of our people by an overwhelming popular demonstration. So great was the faith of the people in his infallibility that for 2 long years everything he suggested or proposed was accepted and the faintest breath of criticism was regarded as treason. So yesterday when in his message he told the Congress that—

We should take the control and the benefits of the essentially local operating utility industry out of a few financial centers and give back that control and those benefits to the localities which produce the business and create the wealth—

Our hearts were with him and our minds acknowledged the soundness of the proposition.

When he further stated that—

It is time to make an effort to reverse that process of the concentration of power which has made most American citizens, once traditionally independent owners of their own businesses, helplessly dependent for their daily bread upon the favor of a very few, who, by devices such as holding companies, have taken for themselves unwarranted economic power—

Those of us who had begun to despair at the disappearance of popular government, at the ruthlessness with which Congress has been stripped of its legislative functions, lifted our heads and began to wonder whether once more we were to be given our constitutional right to at least assist in the making of laws for the government of our land.

When this message informed us that the President was—

Against private socialism of concentrated private power as thoroughly as I am against government socialism—

We were carried away by the thought that this perhaps was a new declaration of independence, the birth of a new freedom, the beginning again of that era where the Government might again become a government by and for the people.

A night's sober reflection brings other thoughts. Remembering the declarations so plainly, freely, and emphatically made in the campaign of 1932, the idea then reborn that the "forgotten man" was once more to be brought to the forefront, no doubt of the President's sincerity arose, but speculation as to how far his advisers might obscure his real purpose could not be downed.

Knowing his high purpose, his heart-felt sympathy for the downtrodden, the underprivileged, we thanked God for a man with his expressed views, and then, remembering that woman of New York who desired to work in her home that she might earn sufficient to keep her family with her, but who was prevented by the operation of one of the codes fostered by the President, and who, when the President was on that vacation across the Pacific, so justly earned and richly deserved, was reached by her cabled message asking permission to continue her labor, was informed, probably not by the President, but by some under secretary, that the code was sacred, could not be violated, we realize that even the high resolves of Presidents, their broad statements of policy, give way to practical political considerations, to the creation of jobs for the faithful, as is evidenced by the work of the Postmaster General, Democratic national committeeman, and the manipulation, even down in Texas, of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation's agents, the results of which so deeply grieve the gentleman from Texas, who complains, but who answers the crack of the party whip.

The optimism, the rejoicing, and the faith in the immediate and ultimate progress of our country, inspired by this message of yesterday, with its broad principles of justice, to which we can all subscribe, is somewhat dampened by our recollection of the President's 100-percent adoption of the Democratic platform, a sound, conservative, yet progressive, statement of general principles, so speedily repudiated, although not forgotten; by the repudiation of the statement of the Democratic candidate for the Presidency, made in October of 1932, that governmental expenses should, and would, be reduced, that the Budget would be balanced, and our present knowledge that, like soldiers marching as to war, the Democratic majority, under the present leadership, has, with banners flying, successfully raided the national resources, so far as is at present discernible, solely for the benefit of the Democratic organization.

Yes; as the message of yesterday told us:

It is time to make an effort to reverse that process of the concentration of power which has made most American citizens, once traditionally independent owners of their own businesses, helplessly dependent for their daily bread upon the favor of a very few.

It is time, Mr. Chairman, to decentralize that power which has been placed over at the other end of the Avenue, the law-making, the judicial power, all tied up in one neat, little package and handed to the executive department, under the guise of the N. R. A. and other similar legislation.

The greatest holding company in the world is that officered by the "brain trusters", and no group of highbinders

ever exploited the members of operating companies more thoroughly and with more disastrous results to the individual than have these gentlemen exploited the taxpayers.

Let us abolish these Delaware holding corporations, whose directors are Cabinet officers or their agents and whose business is the destruction of the enterprises of the individuals of our country, who, by their acts, come in direct competition with those who would remain independent, self-supporting, and the givers of employment to those out of jobs.

Contrary to the President's proclamation on his way through Wisconsin, when he said, "We must not rob Peter to pay Paul", they have robbed both Peter and Paul to pay the political officeholders and manipulators who endeavored, without success, to carry on the many experiments now acknowledged to be failures.

True, those in charge of the present holding companies which the President seeks to abolish are guilty of many abuses which should, and will, be corrected, and they should be deposed from their positions of power, from those positions which enable them to oppress so many. They operate for gain. That the Government holding companies operate for political gain does not lessen the evil. The "brain trusters", extending to them all charity, are exploiting America, American citizens, American industries, for the benefit of the world at large. They have more interest in Europe, Asia, Africa, and the islands of the sea than they have in American homes and American families, and, let us, while we are getting rid of the vicious holding companies, while protecting the stockholders of operating companies, wreck and throw on the scrap heap these governmental agencies which have no excuse for existence except the creation of jobs for the faithful Democrats and the laboratory for the trying out of the experiments of political quacks, many of whom would starve to death if thrown upon their own resources.

We are told that charity begins at home. Let the President start this house cleaning by the dissolution of those great holding companies, the greatest in the history of the world, organized under the laws of the State of Delaware, by Cabinet officers or those in sympathy with them, and which are throttling American business, continuing, if not creating, unemployment, putting the little fellow out of business, and hampering, if not preventing, the return of prosperity.

Take care of the holding companies created by government; we will, by legislation, take care of the others.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to my colleague [Mr. MAHON].

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I come from a great agricultural district in Texas, the Nineteenth Congressional District, composed of 25 west Texas counties. I note that this deficiency bill carries an appropriation of \$60,000,000 for emergency crop loans. I am quite familiar with the circumstances as they exist in that vast drought-stricken area. I know that in my portion of Texas, and I suspect in all portions of the Union, there is a great need for the immediate passage of this bill. I, therefore, rise to urge upon this House the immediate passage of the deficiency measure insofar as this \$60,000,000 item is concerned. I feel that we ought to urge our Senators to see to it that it goes through the Senate immediately in order that the emergency crop loan may be available in time to serve the purpose for which the loan was originally authorized.

I am not in favor of the passage of legislation without sufficient deliberation, but our duty in this matter is plain. The people have already waited a long time for this loan. This is now the 13th day of March, and it is crop-planting time in some sections of the Nation, and shortly it will be cotton-planting time in my district. I know that this loan must be made immediately available to the people in my section if they are to make a crop. The terrible drought has brought on a critical condition. The sandstorms are racing across the areas of west Texas. The people are discouraged. The Congress cannot do a more meritorious thing than to immediately pass this measure and make these loans available to the people.

These emergency crop loans are not an experiment. They are not a gift under the guise of a loan. We have tried them

before and we have found them practicable and helpful. The farmer has proved to be a worthy risk. He has paid back these loans, in many counties almost 100 percent, even though faced with trying conditions. The integrity of our farmers has not been shaken. This appropriation will make it possible for many a farmer to produce a crop in 1935 and feed his family and retain his confidence and self-respect. In many instances it will mean the difference between expensive relief rolls and profitable employment. It is trite to say so, but it is nevertheless true that the welfare of the farmer is the most important factor in national prosperity.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. Yes.

Mr. TABER. How does the condition of the farmers in Texas compare with what it was a year ago?

Mr. MAHON. The condition of the farmers in the 25 counties in my district is much worse today than it was a year ago, because they had at that time gone through one drought; since that time they have gone through a second one, and plenty of them in these 25 counties made nothing during 1934. It is a grave situation.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. Yes.

Mr. RICH. Does the gentleman believe that we ought to continue to restrict the farmers of the country from planting certain crops which would increase production?

Mr. MAHON. That is a very debatable question, but at any rate I feel that we must proceed temporarily along the lines we are now proceeding.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. WEARIN].

Mr. WEARIN. Mr. Chairman, I was very much interested in and pleased with the remarks of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] with reference to seed loans provided in this bill. In the State of Iowa we are faced with the same problem of having to secure an ample supply of seed for crop development and continuation next year. It is of paramount importance that this appropriation bill not only pass but pass in the immediate future, because the planting season in the Middle West is near at hand, and we must get ready for action. Our farmers are due to start field work now at any time the weather permits. It is often possible to prepare the ground in March. Unless that seed reaches us this month, it is going to be useless to the farmers who are destitute. Many people sow legumes in February, but it is entirely feasible to put them in later in the spring with small grain. With that thought in mind, I commend the proposal incorporated in this measure to the Congress most sincerely.

Mr. CHRISTIANSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WEARIN. Yes.

Mr. CHRISTIANSON. As a matter of fact, is it not almost too late now to get the money into the hands of the farmers for some kinds of seed?

Mr. WEARIN. In certain territories that might be true, but generally speaking no; I think the legume crops can be taken care of nicely at the present time if there is no further delay and we can get action within the next 2 weeks. I hope the Department of Agriculture and relief agencies will cooperate in rushing the work.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. BACON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MAAS].

Mr. MAAS. Mr. Chairman, we recently extended the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and one of the pleas advocating the extension was that it would aid the small business man, the independent merchant and industrial concerns who could not get a commercial loan through the normal banking channels. It was certainly a worthy motive and an essential one, if we are going into the business of aiding business. The essence of recovery is the reviving of small business. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation was intended to supplement our normal banking structure, to take up the slack

where banks were not in a position to do so; and yet if you can qualify for a loan under the present administration of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation you do not need a loan. You have to be in such a financial condition to successfully apply for a loan that you could loan money yourself. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation has fallen under the domination of chain banks and the Federal Reserve System. Its purpose and intent is being defeated. Its benefits are being denied to the very group for whose benefit we extended the life of the Corporation. The small business man, when he applies today for a loan from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, is usually told to go back to his own bank and try again. He is delayed thereby, and when he comes back again to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation some time later he is delayed some more by the long-drawn-out tactics of an audit and with unreasonable time taken to report on those audits. Then the business man is called in and told how to run his business, told that everything he is doing is wrong, and told if he will do it all over a different way, which they stipulate, that they will give his application further consideration, so that it has gotten to a point where the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is of no benefit to small independent business at all. It is worse than no benefit. It holds out false hope to the small business man and misleads him. If he knew that he could not get the loan definitely, he might make some other arrangement or possibly peacefully go out of business.

That has been the greatest trouble with the present administration of the R. F. C. This is only typical of it. If we want to revive business in this day, let us give business and industry a chance to find themselves and get on their feet. If they could only know from day to day what the regulations were going to be tomorrow they could plan accordingly. If they could only know under what conditions they were going to have to operate they could proceed accordingly, but they cannot know from hour to hour as things are now. I think sometimes if we washed out the whole proposition of attempting to assist business—although I do not necessarily advocate it at the present time—it might be better. Business men could at least have some basis on which to estimate from time to time what the conditions would be in the near future, if they had to deal with only natural forces.

Mr. FORD of California. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAAS. I yield.

Mr. FORD of California. From 1930 to 1933 there were no restrictions. How successful were they then?

Mr. MAAS. The restrictions were in the operation. Originally the R. F. C. was designed for the large railroads in order to save the insurance companies. Its extension was requested as part of the new deal to aid the small business man.

Mr. CHRISTIANSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAAS. I yield.

Mr. CHRISTIANSON. Has the gentleman ascertained how many loans have been made to small business in the city of St. Paul?

Mr. MAAS. Very few of them, if any. I have not been able to find any, and I know it has been reported that out of \$350,000,000 set aside for loans to small business, there has been about \$7,000,000 of it up to date loaned to small business concerns.

Mr. CHRISTIANSON. I will say to my colleague that the loans in Minneapolis have been very few and very small.

Mr. MAAS. I agree with the gentleman. I have not been able to find any in St. Paul.

Mr. WOODRUFF. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAAS. I yield.

Mr. WOODRUFF. The gentleman is making a real contribution to the subject he is discussing. I want to ask the gentleman this question: Is not something further demanded than loans to business, although that is the primary necessity at the present time; but must not legitimate business men of this country be given the knowledge that they can begin to operate their plants and employ our people without the fear always in their hearts that some morning

they will wake up and find a Government owned and operated business just across the street, manufacturing the same thing and competing with them?

Mr. MAAS. I think the gentleman is absolutely correct. The thing that is holding back business today is fear in the hearts of the business men. They do not dare invest their money. They do not dare put their money into expansion now because of the fear of Government competition and unreasonable Government regulation.

Mr. LUDLOW. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAAS. I yield.

Mr. LUDLOW. The other day we adopted a new formula for making these loans. Has the gentleman any hope there will be more liberalization on the part of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation in the future? I agree in the main with what the gentleman has stated as to past events, but I am prayerfully hoping that under this new formula there will be a more liberalized policy.

Mr. MAAS. No, I do not, because there is a bunch of bureaucrats running the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, many of whom were failures in business, failures in private banking, and so we set them up in the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. [Applause.]

As an illustration, in Minneapolis the R. F. C. was housed in the Federal Reserve Bank. Very few loans have been granted. Now the R. F. C. is housed in elaborate and luxurious private offices in one of the leading office buildings in Minneapolis. I think that the overhead is about equal to the loans that office is making. All this at the taxpayers expense, and when every dollar is so sorely needed for relief of very real distress and actual want on the part of millions of our citizens.

How long do you expect our people to go hungry when they see the Government throw money away in this fashion?

The hard-pressed business man who can help the unemployment situation by continuing in business and perhaps expanding, if given a little helping hand now when he needs it, is treated like a ragged applicant for charity by these high and mighty bureaucrats in the safe security of their luxurious offices—at our expense. The same bureaucrats are assuming the domineering attitude that brought bankers into disrepute. They are certainly doing the same for the Government, whom they misrepresent, or maybe they do correctly represent the Government.

The purpose of the R. F. C. now is supposed to be the aid of small and independent business. It is not doing it. In fact, its only help has been given to the great powerful groups, frequently to the very detriment of the mass of average business men. Frequently the very R. F. C. loans are employed by the powerful borrowers to drive their independent competitors to the wall.

There should immediately be a complete review of the whole administration of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. Let us see to it either that its funds are used to help business or let us abolish it if it is merely to be an arrogant bureaucracy.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MAAS] has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. MOTT].

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, on Monday of this week I had the privilege of presenting to the Committee for Reciprocity Information my views relative to the existing tariff rates on three major commodities of the State of Oregon and the Pacific coast, which are involved in the proposed trade agreement with Italy.

I want to tell you something about the procedure in connection with the making of these agreements under the Foreign Trade Agreement Act of 1934; the act under which the Congress of the United States surrendered all of its effective tariff-making authority to the President of the United States. And then I want to tell you something about what the treaty makers are contemplating doing under this act to three or four of the basic agricultural commodities of the Pacific coast.

There is a prevalent opinion, not only in the country but in Congress as well, that the Congress in passing the so-called "reciprocal trade agreement law" did not give up its entire power in the field of tariff making. There is an impression even in this body that it is only under certain conditions that the President can take the tariff into his own hands and reduce the rates of duty without the consent of Congress. This impression has been fostered by propaganda put out by the State Department and by the sort of propaganda contained in the speech of the Chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON], which he delivered here on March 6, and the speech of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HARLAN] delivered on March 1.

In these speeches and others made recently on the floor of the House by Members of the majority party, the statement was made not only that the President had limited tariff-making jurisdiction under the Foreign Trade Agreement Act but also that all interested parties, including Members of Congress, were afforded full opportunity for a complete and open hearing before the committees or commissions which negotiated the foreign trade agreement. It was the contention of these gentlemen, therefore, that no worthy industry had anything to fear on the score of tariff reductions by reason of the fact that Congress had abdicated in favor of the President in the field of tariff legislation.

Now I think it is high time that gentlemen disabuse their minds of any idea that they have any power or authority whatever over tariff legislation. The Congress of the United States has no more effective authority over tariffs than has a State legislature, and it has not had any such authority since the passage of the Foreign Trade Agreement Act. The reason for this is that under that act the President, without the consent of or ratification of Congress, may enter into a trade agreement with any foreign country whenever he pleases, or may reduce any duty by 50 percent. Such a reduction if made will, of course, effectively destroy any existing tariff duty.

Let me now make clear another fact. You Members of Congress and the people you represent not only have nothing whatever to do with making these treaties, but you do not even have the opportunity of presenting your views to anyone who has anything to do with the making of the treaties. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON], in his argument on the tariff, quoted a former Member of the House, Mr. Beedy of Maine, who had criticized the arbitrary way in which the Ways and Means Committee functioned while the Republican Party was in control of the House.

The gentleman quoted Mr. Beedy as having said that we had come to a point where the relation between the Ways and Means Committee and the House of Representatives was analogous to the relation between a king and his subjects. I was not here when the Republican Party controlled the Ways and Means Committee, and the statement of Mr. Beedy may have been true. But I say to you now that the relationship that exists between the people who make the foreign-trade agreements under the 1934 act and the people of the United States who are most vitally interested in those agreements is a more distant relationship than that existing between a king and his subjects. It has been said that even a cat may look at a king. But I challenge any Member of Congress or any constituent of any Member of Congress to say that he has ever looked at the committee for foreign-trade agreements, which is the committee which finds the facts and makes the recommendations to the President in connection with these trade agreements. I challenge the Chairman of the Ways and Means Committee or any other member to say that he has ever been given an opportunity to appear before this committee. I challenge him even to name the members of that committee, which to date has been an absolutely secret committee.

And so I say that the relationship between the Committee on Foreign Trade Agreements and the Congress or the people is more distant than that between king and subject.

It is more akin to that between the Deity and the common mortal. We can only pray to the members of that committee that they might not injure an industry in which the people we represent are interested, by destroying its tariff, but so far as having any contact whatever with any of them is concerned, we have none, either under the law itself or under any regulation made under the law. I repeat that I want to disabuse your minds of the idea, if you entertain it now, that you did not entirely and unconditionally surrender all of the effective tariff-making power of Congress to the Chief Executive when you passed the Foreign Trade Agreement Act at the last session. I say when you passed it, because I am addressing myself particularly to the members of the majority party. The act did not pass with my vote nor with the vote of a single Republican Member of Congress.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. BREWSTER. I would inquire whether or not the gentleman was able to learn anything as to the committees which actually negotiated these agreements.

Mr. MOTT. That information is entirely secret; it is not given out. The fact finding and recommending committee is the Committee for Foreign Trade Agreements, but the personnel of that committee is to date a secret. It is not known, or, at least, it has never been announced to the public.

Mr. BREWSTER. And I would inquire further whether or not the committee before which we are permitted to appear and file briefs and make presentations has anything to do with those negotiations.

Mr. MOTT. Nothing whatever. The only committee before which we are permitted to appear is the Committee for Reciprocity Information. They are not allowed to make any recommendations; they do not even make any suggestions to the Committee for Foreign-Trade Agreements; their only function is to receive such information as an interested party may desire to give to them. That was the direct and emphatic announcement made by the chairman of the Committee for Reciprocity Information on Monday of this week upon the so-called hearing on the Italian trade agreement.

Another thing is this, and I suggest my colleagues bear it in mind, nobody has any direct right to appear even before the Committee for Reciprocity Information. If you desire to appear before that committee and state your views you may make an application in writing to the chairman of the committee for that purpose. He examines your application, and if he desires you to appear he sends you written notice that you may appear, and he also sends you a copy of the public notice, which states very definitely that the presentation of views before the Committee for Reciprocity Information is not a hearing at all and that it is not to be construed as a hearing. I repeat, therefore, that neither Members of Congress nor their constituents have any rights whatever under this act in the way of presenting their views, testimony, or arguments to anybody having jurisdiction to act upon them. They have no authorized contact, and it is absolutely impossible for them to get any authorized contact, with anybody in the executive department of this Government who has anything whatever to do with the making of these trade agreements.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Is there any mandatory provision which forces this committee before which the gentleman appeared to pass the information which the gentleman or his constituents give to them along to the trade committee.

Mr. MOTT. None whatever, either by virtue of the statute or the regulations. The statement was made by the Chairman of the Committee for Reciprocity Information that it was not a fact-finding committee, and that it was not a recommending committee. The procedure, as I understand it, is this: When views or oral statements are presented to

the Committee for Reciprocity Information they take these views and these statements and make a digest of them. This digest is passed on to the Committee for Foreign Trade Agreements, but not the briefs nor the oral arguments, unless these should be asked for. This committee has no contact whatever with the Committee for Foreign Trade Agreements. Let me repeat that up to this time the personnel of the committee which does the negotiating, which does the studying, and which does the recommending is a secret. Nobody to this day knows who they are. The only person whose name has ever been divulged to the public is Mr. Grady, representing the State Department. He is the Chairman of this Committee for Foreign Trade Agreements.

Now it was also stated by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON], and likewise, I believe, by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HARLAN], that it was not the purpose of the executive department under the Foreign Trade Agreement Act to make agreements with foreign countries which would reduce the tariff to the injury of industries which were of any importance. This certainly is not the fact. To date these foreign-trade agreements have involved tariffs on industries, both agricultural and manufacturing, of major importance to several States of the Union, and more are to follow as rapidly as they can negotiate them.

Mr. DUNN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. DUNN of Pennsylvania. Does the gentleman know of any large industry that has been injured since the reciprocal tariff has been in effect?

Mr. MOTT. Yes. I did not want to discuss that phase of the matter because I would like to devote what time I have remaining to my own industries which are involved in the proposed trade agreement with Italy, but I can mention several industries off-hand which have already been injured by these agreements. They are the sugar industry, the manganese industry, the copper industry, the potato industry, the winter-vegetable industry, and several other industries, both agricultural and manufacturing. I have a complete list of commodities already involved, if the gentleman would like to examine them.

Let me tell you now a little about this proposed trade agreement with Italy. In this proposed agreement the tariffs on three major products of the Pacific Northwest and of the State of Oregon are involved. So far as my own State is concerned, the principal ones we are concerned with are the tariffs on cherries, on filberts, and on walnuts.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. ENGEL. Has the gentleman any information as to whether or not anyone is contemplating lowering the tariff on cherries and those articles?

Mr. MOTT. Unfortunately that information is absolutely secret and there is no way in the world that a Member of Congress can obtain it. That is one of the fundamental objections I have to the Foreign Trade Agreement Act.

Mr. ENGEL. At that hearing there were people representing farmers from Michigan to California making a presentation of facts regarding a product which they did not know and could not even find out a change was contemplated.

Mr. MOTT. That is true. We must shoot entirely in the dark. On direct inquiry from the Tariff Commission I was told that it would be impossible for the Commission to give out any information as to the proposed reduction of a tariff on any particular commodity until after all the studies, which are entirely secret, have been completed. I was informed that it would not be known what tariffs would be reduced until Italy comes in and says what tariffs they would like to have reduced. Then I asked directly if it would be possible to get information as to the procedure and intention of the Committee for Foreign Trade Agreements after Italy disclosed her desires in this regard, and I was told it was not. So the fact is that outside of the privilege that is given an interested party to appear before the Committee on Reciprocity Information, which committee has no jurisdiction whatever in the making of the treaty, no interested party and no Representa-

tive or Senator in Congress has any contact whatever at any stage of the proceedings with any treaty-making body, and the entire negotiations are absolutely secret.

Mr. CITRON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. CITRON. May I ask the gentleman if he thinks that is any worse than what happened a few years ago when a gentleman from my State representing the Manufacturers' Association came into a committee and there secretly tried to connive certain things for certain manufacturers? Does the gentleman think that is a better system?

Mr. MOTT. If that was done, of course I do not condone it, but on the contrary, condemn it. Here is the difference, however. Under the system which prevailed when the Congress of the United States had jurisdiction over tariff making, anyone could appear before the Ways and Means Committee of the House at any stage of the proceeding and present his case. And he presented that case to the committee that actually framed the tariff law. Not only that, but when the Ways and Means Committee finally submitted a bill to the House, then the representatives in Congress of the people themselves had an opportunity to vote upon that tariff bill. They could accept it or amend it or reject it. Under the system which prevails now we have nothing to do with the matter. The whole thing is in the hands of men who were not elected by the people, who are not responsible to the people, and whose identity to date is not even known to the people.

Mr. BREWSTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. BREWSTER. May I ask the gentleman whether or not the Congress of Brazil is now debating whether they will ratify the reductions made in our tariff duties?

Mr. MOTT. I understand that is correct. The Brazilian Congress never went so far as to abdicate its entire tariff-making power to the executive department of that country, as did the American Congress.

Mr. BREWSTER. And may I ask the gentleman whether or not the Belgium Parliament has terminated the power to negotiate agreements, which compelled the announcement in reference to the Belgium treaty at the time it was announced?

Mr. MOTT. That also I understand to be the fact, but just what authority the trade negotiators now have under the laws of Belgium I do not know, but under the laws of the United States these trade negotiators have all the power. No one else in the United States has anything to do with it.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the remainder of the time allotted me is short, and in order that you may have an opportunity of examining the situation in regard to our tariff rates on cherries, filberts, and walnuts, which are involved in this proposed trade agreement with Italy, I am going to put in the Record a transcript of the full statement I made on this subject before the Committee for Reciprocity Information on Monday.

Perhaps the facts which we presented to this committee will do some good. Perhaps they will be passed along to someone who has something to do with negotiating the Italian trade agreement. Perhaps that somebody will consider the facts and will not reduce these necessary existing rates on these important commodities. But the fact remains that under the Foreign Trade Agreements Act we can only hope. That is all we can do about it, because Congress by that law has surrendered its jurisdiction over the subject.

I contend, therefore, that Congress ought to recapture its jurisdiction by repealing the law, and that in this Democrats, as well as Republicans, should join. For, after all, there is no real difference in tariff theory between the Republicans and Democrats, so far as individual opinion is concerned. The only difference is an announced official policy which is put into party platforms largely for historical and traditional reasons.

I know it is true in Republican territory that when a Democrat is elected to Congress the people simply do not pay any attention to what the Democratic platform declarations may be in regard to a tariff policy, because heretofore they

have known if the Democratic Party got into power it would not pay attention to that declaration of tariff policy anyway. I may say that up to this time, so far as I know, and I have tried to follow the history of the thing very closely, no Democratic Congress has ever put into effect a Democratic platform declaration on a tariff policy until the present administration. The reason has been that Democrats, individually, do not believe in free trade any more than Republicans do. Neither, as individuals, do they believe in these reciprocity trade agreements, which are nothing more than thinly disguised free-trade treaties. When you voted for that you did not vote for it because you believed in it, because none of you do. You voted for it simply because it was demanded by a popular President. I venture to say there are not 50 members of the majority party in this House who, if a secret ballot were taken, would vote now in favor of this law, any more than you would vote again for the Economy Act. You did not believe in that, and you have already repudiated it. You should do the same thing with the Foreign Trade Agreement Act.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 4 additional minutes.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, I wish now to have inserted at this point my statement before the Committee for Reciprocity Information:

STATEMENT OF MR. MOTT BEFORE COMMITTEE FOR RECIPROCITY INFORMATION

Cherries

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, the proposed trade agreement with Italy involves the rates of duty upon three horticultural products of major importance to the State of Oregon. These are cherries, filberts, and walnuts. Written briefs on behalf of the industries growing and marketing of these products have been filed with the Committee for Reciprocity Information; the brief on cherries by the Northwest Cherry Growers and Allied Industries Committee, on filberts by the Northwest Pacific Nut Growers Corporation, and on walnuts by the California Walnut Growers Association.

This oral statement or argument will be supplemental to the written statements contained in these briefs. Although filberts and walnuts are grown extensively in all the Pacific Coast States, and cherries in all of these States with Idaho and Utah included, I intend to direct my remarks largely to the industry in Oregon because it is in that State that I am most familiar with it.

It will be my purpose here to try to show the committee three things:

(1) That the business of growing, processing, and marketing cherries, filberts, and walnuts is a major industry of the State of Oregon and that its continuance and prosperity is essential to the welfare of the people of that State;

(2) That the industry was developed to its present proportions through the aid and protection afforded it by the tariff, and that its present existence is due largely to the imposition of the duties provided in the Tariff Act of 1930;

(3) That if these duties are reduced so as to again permit importations of them from Italy at a profit to growers in that country, the industry in the United States will suffer irreparable loss and damage to the permanent detriment of all the people of the State of Oregon.

If I am able to show to the committee by facts that these things are true, then I take it I shall have given a complete and a sufficient reason why, in the making of this proposed trade agreement with Italy, the existing duties on cherries, filberts, and walnuts should not be disturbed.

In the Pacific Coast States and in Idaho and Utah there are growing at the present time more than 4,000,000 cherry trees, a little less than 3,000,000 of which are of bearing age, and a little more than 1,000,000 are of nonbearing age. These cherries are grown upon 62,000 farms, more than 12,000 of which are devoted to the production of cherries on a commercial basis. One-quarter of a million people live on these farms, of which 50,000 are engaged in the growing of cherries on a commercial basis.

The investment involved in the cherry industry is \$36,000,000. The average annual cash turnover is \$14,000,000. The average annual pay roll is \$5,000,000. The industry gives continuous yearly employment to 13,433 people, and the annual number of man-days labor provided by this industry is 2,790,000 man-days at \$2 per day.

The State of Oregon produces about one-fifth of the cherries grown west of the Rocky Mountains. There are nearly 1,000,000 cherry trees now growing in Oregon, a number approximately equal to the population of that State.

In view of what I have just said as to the acreage, the investment, the cash turn-over, the value of the product and the pay roll, all of which facts and figures are established and elaborated in the written brief, I am assuming it is sufficiently clear to the committee that the production and marketing of cherries is a

major industry of the State of Oregon and that its profitable continuance is essential to the welfare of the people of that State.

I come now to my second proposition, that this industry was largely developed to its present proportions through the protection of the tariff, and that the industry was saved by the Tariff Act of 1930.

Up to and including the year 1929 production of cherries on the Pacific coast was almost entirely absorbed by the canning industry. In that year, due partly to competition of cheaper canned fruits, such as peaches, apricots, pineapples, etc., but due chiefly to the lack of purchasing power of the people, all canners curtailed their cherry pack, and since that year the annual pack of canned cherries, which is necessarily one of the most expensive methods of processing that product, has greatly decreased. By 1931 the demand for cherries for canning had almost disappeared and in many localities the 1931 crop was not even harvested.

Had it not been for the tariff on cherries which went into effect following approval of the Tariff Act of 1930 the cherry industry would have become virtually a ruined industry in that year. Up until 1930 Italy had been exporting to the United States an increasingly large amount of cherries in brine annually. The average annual importations from Italy for the years 1927, 1928, and 1929 was 17,500,000 pounds, while the average production of cherries in brine in the United States for the same years was 4,037,000 pounds.

The imposition of a tariff of 5½ cents per pound on unpitted cherries in brine and 9½ cents on pitted cherries under the act of 1930 enabled the American grower, who, on account of the reasons stated, had lost the major part of his canned-cherry market, to barrel his cherries in brine and sell them here in competition with the Italian product. Except for the tariff the American grower could not have done this and his market, which was and still is confined to the United States, would have been permanently lost. His \$36,000,000 investment would have been sunk and the industry itself ruined.

From that time on, and solely by reason of the imposition of duty rates which made importation of brined cherries from Italy increasingly difficult, the American grower has gradually captured the American market for cherries in brine, as will be seen by the following:

In 1929 the importations of cherries from Italy, which incidentally is the only country which has competed in the United States with the domestic product, amounted to 22,289,000 pounds, practically all of which were brined cherries. By 1933 these importations had dropped to 686,000 pounds. During the same period the production and sale in this country of American cherries in brine increased from 4,037,000 pounds in 1929 to 18,750,000 pounds in 1933. This latter figure is about 1,000,000 pounds greater than the combined total average annual consumption of brined cherries in the United States for the 5 years prior to 1933.

From this it will be seen that there is no shortage of brined cherries. American growers now produce in every normal year more cherries than are consumed in this country. Once in a long while we have a short crop of cherries on the Pacific coast. We had one in 1934. Had it not been for that short crop there would now be a large surplus carried over in 1935.

The cherry crop from now on will increase rapidly on account of the new plantings made from 1923 to 1928, and these are just now coming into bearing. In the entire West nearly one-half of the total number of cherry trees are still of nonbearing age while in Oregon there are about three-fourths as many trees of nonbearing age as there are of bearing trees.

This surplus which will become increasingly huge, must find its outlet, if it finds one at all, through the brined product, which is by far the cheapest method of processing and the one, therefore, through which this product must be made increasingly available to the people of the United States.

If I have made clear to you thus far the facts themselves, which since they are facts of record cannot, I imagine, be subject to dispute, then I may assume that the truth of the first two propositions advanced at the beginning of this statement, namely, that the production of cherries is a major industry of the State of Oregon and that its profitable continuance is essential to the welfare of the people of that State, and second that it owes its present existence to the existing tariff on cherries has been established. I wish to undertake now to show that without this tariff the industry cannot continue as a profitable industry, which means, of course, that without the tariff it will not continue at all.

The Tariff Act of 1922 imposed a duty of 2 cents a pound on cherries in their natural state, sulphured or in brine, and on maraschino cherries and cherries prepared and preserved in any manner, 40 percent ad valorem. Cherries in their natural state, with the exception of a few varieties, are seldom shipped to any great distance. The tariff of 2 cents a pound on cherries, sulphured or in brine, was entirely ineffective so far as preserving the American market for the American producer of this product. The Presidential proclamation, under the flexible tariff provision, which increased the duties on sulphured and brined cherries to 3 cents, was likewise utterly ineffective. Due to the low cost of production in Italy, the Italians were able to grow and process these cherries, ship them to the United States in subsidized Italian bottoms, pay the tariff, and sell them here at a profit. Products of any kind, agricultural or otherwise, can and are shipped to a foreign country and sold there only when they can be sold at a profit. Where, by reason of an increase in the tariff, or otherwise, they can no longer be sold at a profit, the importations automatically stop.

The fact that the Italians did from 1922 to 1930, while previous tariff rates were in effect, export to and sell in the United States an average annual tonnage of cherries in brine approximately equal to the total consumption of the brined product in this country, is proof in itself that no duties prior to those imposed in the 1930 act were high enough to prevent the Italian product from being imported into the United States and sold at a profit. During the last year prior to the 1930 act, the year 1929, the Italians exported to and sold in the United States the largest tonnage of brined cherries they had ever shipped to this country, namely, 23,910,000 pounds. The Tariff Act of 1930 increased the rates to a point where importation of cherries from Italy became unprofitable and, therefore, the importations ceased. The rates imposed by the 1930 act were 5½ cents per pound for sulphured cherries in brine with pits, and 9½ cents per pound with pits removed. In the year immediately following the approval of the 1930 act the importations dropped to less than one-third of what they had been the year before, and by 1933 the importations had practically ceased.

All that it is necessary now to do in order to turn over again the entire brined cherry market of the United States to the Italians is to reduce the tariff to a point where Italian cherries may again be profitably sold in the United States and Italy will immediately export 23,000,000 pounds of brined cherries a year to the United States or whatever amount may be necessary in any year to supply the American market.

It is wholly impossible, even if it were desirable, to compete with Italy in the production of cherries. We cannot compete with Italy and still maintain our standards of living and of wages any more than we can compete with the Japanese or Chinese. In that portion of Italy where cherries are grown commercially, according to the figures furnished to me by the Department of Commerce, the present wages paid to agricultural labor ranges from 8.3 cents per hour for men to 4.6 cents per hour for women and 4.4 cents per hour for boys. The agricultural worker in Italy lives in an almost primitive manner. His diet is restricted to the simplest and cheapest foods. Such items as coffee, sugar, etc., are almost entirely out of his reach. He wears clothing produced in Italy at wages and under conditions which would not be tolerated in this country. His housing costs are practically nothing. No great amount of heat is required, especially in the southern districts, and his fuel item is negligible. No American farm family either could or would live upon the same standards as the Italian farm family and the same is true as to agricultural hired labor in the two countries.

This, however, is not all. Most of the farms in Italy are so small and the average family so large that in many cases it is not necessary for the farmer to employ agricultural help at all in order to harvest and market his cherry crop and the producer, therefore, is relieved for the most part of the necessity of paying even the wages I have cited, wages, which, in this country, would be considered as starvation wages and which are not available to any American cherry grower or operator in any branch of the cherry industry in connection with the growing, processing, or marketing of his crop.

To compete with Italians in the production of cherries would obviously mean a reduction of our standards of living and of wages to a level with theirs. No one, I think, wants to do that. The point I am making here is that it is not possible. It cannot be done in the United States.

Like the producer of most other farm commodities in this country the American cherry grower is now and for several years has been selling his product at a loss. At the present time the selling price of cherries is about one-half the cost of production. Complete statistics on this subject are contained in the brief and I shall not argue them here. The reason for this is, of course, the economic depression from which we are all suffering, whether we are engaged in agriculture or in some other industry, and which, we hope, is temporary. If we thought it was going to be permanent, we would not stay in the cherry-growing business any more than we would remain in any other branch of the farming industry. The cherry producers have sustained this loss because they had to, because they cannot abandon their industry and their investment nor surrender their market which the 1930 Tariff Act enabled them to capture, pending the return of normal conditions in this country. Any reduction whatever in the tariff will simply further reduce the price at which they must sell their product and to that extent increase their losses.

Now, I want to be perfectly frank and say to you that the only kind of a tariff that will do the cherry grower any good whatever is a tariff which is high enough to make it impossible for the Italians, who are their only foreign competitors, to ship cherries into this country and sell them at a profit. On the other hand, the only kind of a reduction in tariff rates that will do the Italian grower any good is a reduction low enough to enable the Italian grower again to ship his product here, pay the tariff, and still sell at a profit. Any other kind of a reduction would be of no value whatever to Italy, and Italy therefore would have no reason for asking for it.

It is obvious, therefore, that whatever tariff rate on cherries Italy may ask for or accept in negotiating the proposed trade agreement will, of necessity, be a rate that will enable her to produce her cherries in Italy, ship them to this country, pay that tariff rate, and still sell them in the American market at a profit. Italy could have no other conceivable reason for asking a reduction in the duty on cherries. And since, as I have shown, Americans cannot compete in price with Italians in the production of cherries, that means that the Italians would recapture the American market

for brined cherries. That the loss of that market would ruin the industry in America has already been shown. I venture to state it, therefore, as a reasonably demonstrated fact that the granting to Italy of any reduction in cherry duties which she would either ask for or to accept would mean the inevitable destruction of the commercial cherry industry, with its consequent irreparable loss and injury to the people of my own State and to the entire Pacific coast.

Filberts

What I have said of the cherry industry is applicable generally to the filbert industry. There are several features connected with the growing and marketing of filberts, however, which distinguish that industry not only from the cherry industry but from every other agricultural or horticultural industry, so far as the people I represent are concerned.

The production of filberts is peculiarly an Oregon industry. It is confined almost entirely to the States of Oregon and Washington, the 2 States producing 98 percent of the entire crop of the United States. The State of Oregon alone contained 83 percent of all the growing filbert trees listed in the 1930 census, and that percentage has increased considerably during the last 5 years.

Furthermore, filbert growing is confined only to certain portions of these two States; in Oregon to the Willamette Valley and in Washington to the southwestern counties between the Columbia River and Puget Sound. The reason for this is that the soil and climate of this restricted area is the only portion of the United States where filberts can be grown commercially. In fact it is one of the few areas in the world where this highly distinctive and valuable nut thrives. The other filbert-growing areas of commercial importance are southern Italy, Spain, Turkey, and other Mediterranean countries, which up until the time the present tariff rates on filberts were imposed, supplied most of the American market with this product.

Although the filbert-growing industry on a commercial basis in Oregon is only about 15 years old we already have more than five and a half million dollars invested in it. It is the fastest growing agricultural industry in the Pacific Northwest. In this comparatively small area we have 4,400 acres of bearing trees, 4,300 acres of trees which will reach bearing age in from 1 to 4 years, and 1,250 trees which were planted this year.

The present acreage, of course, represents but a fraction of the total acreage in this favored area which is capable of producing filberts commercially. With the entire United States as a potential market for a product which in its highly developed and improved form is not equaled by the product of any foreign country, the possibilities for the future of this industry are almost limitless.

With proper tariff protection which will allow us to develop this industry and its market to the point where it is capable of being developed and where it ought to be developed, the prosperity of the farmer in western Oregon and Washington will be assured, because he will become increasingly engaged in an agricultural specialty in which there is no competition in this country, and at the same time he will be taking out of production land on which surplus crops are now grown—crops which at present come into competition with farmers in every State in the Union.

The development of the domestic market for filberts has not been coincident with the increase in its tariff protection to the same extent as obtains in the cherry market. There are several reasons for this, one being that filberts have never been given an adequate tariff protection, as have cherries since the passage of the 1930 act. The present rates of 5 cents on unshelled nuts and 10 cents on shelled are entirely inadequate to keep out the foreign product, which, on account of the low cost of production in Italy, can be sold here at a profit after paying that rate of duty. The tariff has, however, inadequate as it is, served to keep the price of the product higher than it would be without it, and it has been responsible to some extent for reducing the importations since it went into effect, thereby enlarging the American market for the American producer to the extent of the decrease in importations.

Prior to the Tariff Act of 1930, the rate on filberts was 2½ cents per pound for unshelled nuts and 5 cents per pound for shelled. Like any other ridiculously low rate on any product, this duty had no effect whatever on foreign importations. I may say in passing that the difference in cost of production of filberts here and in Italy is even greater than that of cherries. The filberts of Italy are grown with little, if any, cultivation, and with practically no standardization or grading. All the Italian does to harvest his crop of filberts is to pick them off the ground when they fall at the proper season, and take them to his own home, where he and his family crack them by hand under no supervision, sanitary or otherwise. They are not washed, dried, graded, or processed in any way, as is required under American methods or American standards. No American farmer can compete with those methods or with those standards of living.

Americans cannot grow or harvest crops in that way, whether they be filberts, cherries, or any other farm product. In the first place the Oregon farmer has an actual average investment of \$666 in every acre of bearing trees, as will be seen by reference to exhibit D in the brief, and it costs him 13.7 cents per pound to produce his crop. The break-down for this will be found in exhibit B. The Italian can produce his crop for a mere fraction of this amount, probably for a cost of not to exceed 3 cents. The price to the American grower last year was from 8 to 9 cents, which on account of the low tariff is, of course, a competitive price, the American buyer having the opportunity of purchasing either the American or the Italian product. The Italian grower last year produced and sold his filberts at a cost which permitted

the Italian buyer in Italy to take that product, pay the freight on it to New York, pay a tariff of 5 cents per pound, and sell it here at a profit in a market where the price was from 8 to 9 cents. If the Italian grower made a profit his total cost of production per pound could not have exceeded the actual farm labor cost of producing a pound of filberts in Oregon, and it would have been less than one-half the item of interest alone chargeable per pound of nuts to interest on his bearing-orchard investment.

I have no desire to elaborate further upon this point. As I stated in my remarks on the cherry industry, Americans cannot compete with Italians in the production of a competitive agricultural commodity to be sold in this country any more than they can compete with Japs or Chinamen, and if you are going to give Italians competitive access to American horticultural markets the American horticultural industry in those competitive products will have to cease.

The small tariff on filberts, while not sufficient to prevent the filbert grower from operating at a loss, has at least given him a chance to dispose of his steadily increasing production and to hold the market for it. He had hoped at this session of the Congress for an increase in filbert tariffs sufficient to enable him to hold that increasing market at a profit instead of a loss, and he would have received that increase had not the Congress, under the 1934 tariff act, transferred its effective tariff-making authority to the Chief Executive. Please do not construe this statement as political. I am simply stating a fact that is quite familiar to everyone in Congress. I know of no Member of that body, whether Democrat or Republican, who would have objected to this necessary increase on the filbert tariff.

I say the 1930 tariff of 5 cents per pound on unshelled and 10 cents per pound on shelled filberts enabled the American grower, by sustaining what he had every reason to believe was a temporary loss, to capture and hold the market for the increasing supply of his product, a supply which will increase rapidly from year to year as the 4,500 acres of nonbearing trees come into bearing. The nonbearing trees now exceed the bearing trees and new plantings are now being put out at the rate of about 1,000 acres a year. That it would have been impossible for him to hold this market at the 1922 rate, I think will be admitted by everyone who knows anything about the subject, because under the old rate the Italian product could have been sold here last year at 5 cents per pound, which is about 40 percent of the cost of production in the United States. Under the 1930 rate the Italians sold their product here at about 70 percent of the cost of production in America.

Prior to the time the 1930 tariff rates went into effect practically the whole American filbert market was supplied from importation from foreign countries, including Italy. Importations increased with the demand, until in 1929, the last year prior to the imposition of the new rates, there were imported into the United States 21,000,000 pounds of filberts at an average price so low no American grower could compete with them. Fortunately the supply of the American product up until that time had not been large. The year after the 1930 rates were imposed, importations dropped to 15,000,600 pounds, with an increase in the sale of American filberts. The next year importations dropped to 12,600,000 pounds and the American grower absorbed a little more of the American market. In 1933 importations had gone down to 8,100,000 and last year the importations were 7,900,000 pounds. These figures are based on importations of both shelled and unshelled nuts by a mathematical calculation which gives the equivalent of unshelled nuts.

The figures I have given include total importations from all filbert-producing countries. The Italian imports in 1929 were 5,459,000 pounds. After the 1930 rates went into effect Italian importations decreased at about the same rate as the imports from other countries, diminishing to 1,881,000 pounds in 1933.

During the same years the increase in the sale of American filberts in the United States was as follows: In 1929, 200,000 pounds; in 1931, 700,000 pounds; in 1932, 800,000 pounds; in 1933, 2,000,000 pounds; and in 1934, 2,261,000 pounds.

As our domestic production increases we desire to dispose of it and to dispose of it at a profit. Whether we dispose of that product at a profit or a loss depends upon whether we receive adequate tariff protection or not. In the case of cherries I stated that an adequate tariff was one that was high enough to keep the foreign product out of this country altogether. The reason for that, as I explained, was that the American cherry grower already was producing enough of his product to completely supply the American market. Therefore any tariff low enough to permit importation of cherries at a profit to the Italian grower is obviously an inadequate tariff.

An adequate tariff on filberts is, in my opinion, arrived at by a slightly different method, although its practical results are the same so far as the American grower is concerned. We do not produce enough filberts at the present time to supply the demand. The total American consumption last year was about 10,000,000 pounds of which the American grower supplied a little more than 2,500,000. Our production is increasing so rapidly, however, that within a very short time our production will be equal to the total consumption for last year, and from then on it will surpass it by an increasing amount each year. It should be remembered that in the last 4 years, from 1929 to 1934, our production increased from 200,000 pounds to more than two and a half million pounds, and that in 1935 there are more trees of nonbearing age than of bearing age, with new plantings averaging 1,000 acres a year.

Until our production reaches an amount equivalent to total consumption of foreign and domestic filberts, an adequate tariff is one which will assist the American producer to sell his product

in America at a profit. Such a tariff will until that time be a competitive tariff. It will not shut out the Italian for it will enable him to increase his price also while supplying that part of the market which we cannot yet supply.

Let me make this clear, however: The moment our production of filberts equals consumption, then the method by which an adequate filbert tariff should be determined changes to that proposed in my statement on the cherry tariff, for when we are able to supply the entire domestic market without importations, then the tariff should be fixed at a point below which neither the Italian nor any other foreign grower can sell his product here at a profit. In other words, the tariff then should be sufficient to shut out the foreign product altogether, and leave the entire market to the American producer. The price then will be regulated by supply and demand.

There is no reason why the American market should not in time absorb a filbert production of 50,000,000 pounds per year. Consumption of this product, which is and for some years to come will be an expensive one, is at its low stage. This is due principally to the lack of purchasing power on the part of the people, and that lack of purchasing power has affected every agricultural and horticultural product. But, as in the case of cherries, we hope and we believe, this will not always last. During the 5 years preceding the depression the average yearly consumption of filberts in the United States was about 23,000,000 pounds, practically all of which were imported.

If normal times return there will again be that consumption immediately, and if we have proper tariff protection that consumption will be supplied entirely by American growers. The annual consumption of the 5-year predepression period, however, is much less than what could be consumed or what will be consumed every year when the whole people become familiar with this product. A comparatively small portion of our population have even discovered the filbert as yet. It is a new product, particularly in its present improved form. The filbert of today is a 100 percent better product than it was in the predepression period. In the regions where it is grown it is perhaps the most popular of all nuts at the present time. As soon as the people of the country get to the place where again they can buy the things they want the consumption of filberts in the United States will not only return to its predepression high point, but it will go steadily on from there indefinitely. All the filbert industry needs now is to give it the tariff protection it is entitled to and its future will be assured.

Walnuts

I had intended at this time to cover briefly the subject of walnuts, but on account of the time already consumed, and because of the fact that two very able men from our sister State of California are here to present their arguments in behalf of that product, I will content myself by stating generally that so far as Oregon is concerned, the case of the walnut industry insofar as production markets and the tariff are involved is almost parallel with that of the cherry industry. It has the same history, it was developed in the same way, by tariff protection, it has reached a similar position with regard to supply and demand. It has the same problem in regard to foreign competition, from which it should be relieved entirely by an adequate tariff. It occupies the same position in my State as the cherry industry does, and the prosperity of that State is just as much dependent upon the profitable continuance of that industry as it is of the cherry industry.

Like cherries and filberts we are holding our walnut market by sustaining for the time being a loss, until general purchasing power is revived, and we want no reduction in our meager tariff of 5 cents per pound for the unshelled and 15 cents per pound for the shelled product, which would again permit the importation of 59,000,000 pounds of walnuts into this country every year, which was the figure for the year immediately preceding the imposition of the increased rates under the act of 1930. From the time that tariff was imposed it had the same effect upon the walnut industry as the 1930 rates had upon the cherry industry. Imports decreased from 59,000,000 pounds in 1929 to 17,000,000 pounds in 1934, and as these imports diminished the sale of the American product increased. We have now captured our own market for our own walnuts. To turn this market back to the foreign producers, who live and produce their commodity on a scale of living which we would not even tolerate, would be nothing short of criminal, and I for one refuse to believe that anyone in the executive branch of my Government is going to do that, even though by virtue of the 1934 Tariff Act they may have that power.

Gentlemen of the committee, we do not have to ruin American industry, we do not have to rob the farmers of the West coast who have put their life savings into cherry and filbert and walnut farms, we do not have to blight the agricultural future of my State and kill its hope for prosperity in order to carry on legitimate trade with Italy or with any foreign country. Italy grows and makes many products we do not produce and which we have no desire or opportunity of producing. We welcome the importation of those products. We are glad to have them and to pay fair prices for them, prices far beyond what the producer can receive in his own country.

We in turn produce many things which Italy cannot produce, or at least does not produce. We are glad to send these things to Italy and sell them there in fair competition with the producers of other nations. This is natural trade with Italy. It is the kind of trade which hurts neither of us, but which benefits both of us.

Make a trade agreement with Italy in regard to these products if you must make an agreement, although in my own opinion no agreement as to these noncompetitive products is necessary either with Italy or any other country. We will carry on trade with Italy in those products whether any agreement is made or not.

But as to competitive products which are raised in both countries, products which on account of the difference in the cost of production Italians can profitably ship to the United States but which the United States cannot ship to Italy—products like cherries, filberts, and walnuts—on such products I say there is no reason upon any ground for making a trade agreement at all even if it were possible to make a fair agreement. But when such a trade agreement is proposed to be negotiated through the lowering of necessary tariff rates on such products, so as to rob the American producer of his own market, and to oblige him either to abandon his industry altogether or to reduce his standard of living to a level of that of the foreign producer, then I say the proposal is wrong, it is uneconomic, it is unpatriotic, and I repeat again that I cannot believe that any executive officer of this Government will do it.

So much, then, for the proposed trade agreement with Italy. Now, I have just been notified that the State Department has published notice that it intends to enter into a trade agreement with Canada. In that our protective tariff on lumber and on shingles will be involved. In normal times more than half of the entire pay roll of my State comes from lumber and its allied industries. My constituents, Democrats and Republicans alike, are writing me and wiring me to do everything I can to save their lumber tariff, just as they have implored me to try to save the tariff on cherries and filberts and walnuts.

Many of you have already received similar appeals from your people, and before this Congress adjourns you will all receive them, whether you be Democrats or Republicans. If Congress again had jurisdiction over the tariff, you and I know we could save our industries. You and I would have something to say about it, and we both know what we would say and how we would vote. Therefore I appeal to you, regardless of party, to join in repealing the 1934 act.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MOTT. If I may have one-half minute more, I just want to remind the House of the fact that the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM], who has introduced a bill to repeal the Foreign Trade Agreements Act, is a Democrat, a good one and real one, and I hope this bill may have the support of everybody on both sides of the House. [Applause.]

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

I wish to give the House an outline of the bill with respect to the items appearing in it for deficiencies and for supplemental purposes, and as concisely as possible, why they are necessary.

We will first take the Veterans' Administration. There is an item of \$94,650,000 for pensions and compensation which is caused by several acts of Congress in liberalizing payments to veterans, including Spanish War veterans, their widows, and so forth. This was caused primarily by an amendment to the Independent Offices Appropriation Act at the last session of Congress at which time the necessary appropriation was not provided. This money is granted to cover the period from April 1 to June 30 next.

The National Archives was established by a new act last session and \$50,000 has been appropriated for the fiscal year 1935. We are providing them with an operating administrative fund of \$475,000, of which \$75,000 is for 1935 and \$400,000 for 1936. The estimate was \$550,000, but we reduced the estimate \$75,000.

For the exposition in California, which was authorized by a recent act, \$350,000 is carried. It is necessary if the departments are to prepare, transport, and install their exhibits out there, to appropriate the entire amount which includes \$125,000 for a Government building.

Next is the high commissioner to the Philippine Islands authorized by the Philippine Independence Act. There was submitted an estimate of \$225,000 and we appropriated \$165,000, believing this would be sufficient as the estimate was based upon a full fiscal-year basis and they will not be ready for a commonwealth status until about the first of next January. They have to draft a constitution, which has been done, they have to send it over here for the

President's approval, and it is on its way, and then it has to go back and be submitted to the people at a general election. There are many intermediate actions before the commonwealth is in existence and it probably will be the first of January before they are ready.

There is a peculiar angle about the Philippine situation. I thought that we were going to start immediately in making reductions in our appropriations with respect to our ownership of the Philippines. As a matter of fact, for the next 10 years we will be subject to an increased cost in maintaining the Philippines. We will keep whatever part of our Army and Navy we have had over there at a cost of about \$13,000,000 or \$14,000,000, and in addition to that, we have to maintain this High Commissioner for the next 10 years at a cost of about \$175,000 a year. It is true we cease paying the Resident Commissioners from the Philippine Islands, including their clerk hire and mileage, but as a matter of fact, as a result of all the legislation on the Philippine Islands we are subjected to about \$140,000 a year more expenses for the next 10 years than we have had in the past. In addition there is already agitation for the erection of a building there to accommodate the offices of the High Commissioner and his staff and also possibly as a residence for the High Commissioner with the view that after the 10 years are up it may be used for the diplomatic, consular, and whatever other representation we may have there. Perhaps, in the long run Philippine independence may be a good thing, perhaps not—who knows?

For the Forest Service there is \$2,348,000 for fighting forest fires, which is the ordinary deficiency. In other words, we never appropriate in advance for the Forest Service to fight fires the amount we think they ought to have. We provide a nominal amount of \$100,000 in the regular appropriation bill to carry the language governing this expenditure and the law authorizes the Forest Service in fighting fires to incur a deficit, so every year we appropriate to cover this deficit. Unfortunately, we have had an unusually large number of fires this year on account of the drought. We have had over 10,000 fires in the national forests and this is unusual. The average number is 7,000. About 600,000 acres in forest area were burned. This appropriation will leave \$166,000 for emergency work during the remainder of the fiscal year, together with the \$100,000 to be provided in the 1936 agricultural appropriation bill.

For the War Department there is appropriated \$6,683,000 for deficiencies. Why? When we passed the War Department appropriation bill at the last session it was figured on an average cost per ration of 31.5 cents. The average price of the ration for the first 7 months of this fiscal year was 41.6 cents.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I yield.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. There has been an awful lot of complaint all over the country about the price of food going up. I am surprised that the price of rations did not go up more in comparison with the increase in price among the civilians. Can the gentleman explain the cause of this? Has the gentleman's committee gone into the question of why the price has jumped from 31.5 cents to 41.6 cents?

Mr. BUCHANAN. We have not gone into the economic causes for rise in the price of food. We know it has risen, we know the price of paper has risen, we know the price of many commodities has risen.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. The gentleman cannot give an opinion as to why the price of foodstuffs for the Army and the Navy has gone up to such an amount—almost 14 or 15 percent?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Can the gentleman from New York?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I am trying to find out—I would like to find out.

Mr. WOODRUM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I yield.

Mr. WOODRUM. The gentleman knows that it was the deliberate purpose of the Department of Agriculture to raise the price of foodstuffs. I see the gentleman from Kansas

on his feet, perhaps he can tell us. That is one deliberate purpose of the Agriculture Department.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Not only the deliberate purpose of the Agriculture Department, but it was the deliberate purpose of the administration to restore the price levels of 1926. Of course, the restrictive legislation here and there on production has had the effect of increasing prices.

Mr. COLDEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I yield.

Mr. COLDEN. Is it not true that the Army has contracts for supplies and so is not affected by this rise of the prices of food at the present time?

Mr. BUCHANAN. That is not entirely true.

Mr. WOODRUM. The gentleman will realize that these appropriations are for contracts in the future, for 1936. What the gentleman says is entirely true as to contracts for 1935. These appropriations are to take effect next July.

Mr. BUCHANAN. The additional amount for subsistence of the Army is \$3,465,000. This is the largest deficiency of the War Department. There are other amounts growing out of acts of Congress, principally the reduction in overseas duty from 3 to 2 years, and on account of increases in the price of forage and fuel.

Now, take the Post Office Department, which the gentleman from New York [Mr. MEAD], spoke about a few minutes ago; that requires \$3,049,000. That was the estimate, and we allowed it. The sum of \$2,500,000 of that is for the 10 percent additional for night work for clerks in the first- and second-class offices. That is authorized by law.

There is also included \$500,000 for the City Delivery Service, of which \$300,000 is for necessary expenditures because of the increased business during the Christmas holidays and \$200,000 is for the 10 percent additional for night work. Then \$49,000 is for the increase in the price of stationery. These three items make up the \$3,049,000. They are all legitimate items that ought to be allowed.

Next the Treasury Department: The estimates sent to us were \$1,429,504 and we allowed all except \$52,000. The sum of \$97,000 is to provide for the increased cost of stationery supplies. That is a necessary and legitimate item. We gave \$1,332,504 for the Coast Guard. When we passed the appropriation bill last year it was based upon the theory that when we repealed the prohibition amendment, smuggling operations would decrease. Anticipating their decrease, we decreased the appropriation for the Coast Guard.

As a matter of fact that anticipation was not realized. Smuggling, instead of decreasing, probably increased and here is the cause of it. Pure grain alcohol has been smuggled into this country in enormous quantities. They smuggle it in in cases, 3 gallons to each tin container and 2 containers in a case. The amount of internal-revenue tax and customs duties which would be due the United States upon entry of one of those cases would be \$80. They have been smuggling this pure alcohol, which, of course, is concentrated, into the United States in vast quantities, and it has been estimated that if all the existing tax had been paid upon the quantities smuggled into the United States it would have amounted to about \$50,000,000 in revenue.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Yes.

Mr. LUDLOW. Supplementary to what my chairman says, the testimony was developed before our subcommittee, and expressed in a form of graphs, that in certain sectors of the Atlantic coast, smuggling has largely increased since the repeal of prohibition.

Mr. BUCHANAN. That is true. The situation became so acute that through consultation of the Secretary of the Treasury, the Director of the Budget, and others, the apportionment of the appropriation was waived and the Coast Guard, to prevent this smuggling, was permitted to increase its activities and its expenses. The appropriation we allow here will do nothing more than permit them to carry on the same operation they now have to the end of this fiscal year and it will be the same personnel that is provided under

the appropriation we have passed in the regular Treasury Department appropriation bill for the next fiscal year.

As a whole, the estimates that come to our committee for deficiencies and supplementary direct appropriations amount to \$112,422,801.04. Your committee reduced specific items of that appropriation by about \$190,500. However, we added about \$38,500 on account of items for the legislative branch, and that left a net reduction of \$152,000 under the estimates for this bill. It is gratifying that when we allow all these amounts, even those caused by new acts of Congress, we are still under the Budget. [Applause.]

In this bill is included \$60,000,000 for crop-production loans, under a new act of Congress not anticipated when the Budget for 1936 was sent to Congress. In fact, it was anticipated by the administration that it would not be passed, but we passed and sent it to the President and he has approved it. On what ground? On the ground that it involves a relief measure and must come out of the work-relief funds, the \$4,880,000,000 relief bill that we passed in the House, and which they are now considering over in the Senate. The President sent an estimate to Congress providing that the \$60,000,000 should come out of the \$4,880,000,000 relief fund.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Yes.

Mr. SHORT. The Senate bill really called for an appropriation of \$100,000,000 for the purchase of seed, did it not?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Yes; but I am discussing the crop-production loan-authorization bill after it passed both Houses and was agreed upon in conference.

Mr. SHORT. The \$60,000,000 is a very conservative estimate when we consider the seriousness of the drought.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Now, the problem presented to the committee was this: If this money was to be allocated from the appropriation in that joint resolution (H. J. Res. 117), now pending in the Senate, it would be entirely too late for seed loans in many sections of the United States. There is no telling when that resolution may finally pass. So the problem was to provide the money in such a way that it would be charged to the funds in that resolution when it finally did pass. Therefore, we appropriated \$60,000,000 from the unexpended balance in the \$525,000,000 drought-relief appropriation of last session, which happened to be a little over \$60,000,000. That unexpended balance in the drought-relief fund has been reserved by the President and its expenditure prevented, in order that it might be available to help make up the \$4,880,000,000 in the work-relief resolution. So that we have carried out the President's estimate as he sent it to this House, through the means of selecting an unexpended balance that is a part of the \$4,880,000,000 fund and reappropriating it in this bill, without any increase in the estimated Budget expenditures.

I thank you and I yield back the balance of my time. [Applause.]

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made this afternoon and to include therein a statement which I made before the Committee for Reciprocity Information on Monday of this week relative to the tariff on cherries, walnuts, and filberts.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I wish that time permitted a very exhaustive discussion of the matter that was just alluded to by the distinguished Chairman of the Committee on Appropriations with respect to the smuggling of alcohol. The fact is that every time 2½ gallons of proof alcohol comes into this country, smuggled from some outside source, it represents the smuggling into our country of 1 bushel of corn. Since I live in the Corn Belt, obviously I am deeply interested in corn that comes in, because it is the equivalent of defeating the 25-cent tariff that is imposed upon all corn imported into this country.

That is only a prelude after all, to what I want to say, with respect to some of the inconsistencies in the operation and

administration of the Agricultural Adjustment Act. On the 25th of February there was landed in the port of Baltimore, which is only 40 miles away from the United States Capital, 3,000,000 bushels of corn which came from the Argentine. On the 6th of March 1935 there was landed in the port of New York 6,000 tons of corn from the Argentine. As you skim the daily bulletins and gradually unearth these little bits of fact, we find that rye has come from Poland and Latvia and landed in New York; it goes to Albany, it goes to Duluth, and it goes to Chicago. Oats are coming in from the Argentine. This will be of particular interest to the gentleman from Iowa. The oats are shipped by water and are being processed into oatmeal in the State of Iowa today. Think of it! Argentine oats processed into oatmeal in the State of Iowa. Two million pounds of pork, chilled and frozen, have come in from Canada, paying a duty of 2½ and ¾ percent under the 1930 Tariff Act.

Let me submit to the Members of this House that we passed the Agricultural Adjustment Act, and pursuant thereto we took 6,200,000 little pigs off the market. Then we took 200,000 brood sows. Then we contracted and took out of cultivation 12,600,000 acres of corn land in the Corn Belt of the country—over twelve and one-half million acres. We said to the farmers, "You reduce your acreage by 20 percent and we will give you 30 cents a bushel upon the average that was not grown." We also asked them to reduce the farrowings of hogs by 25 percent, and then we paid them \$5 a head on the hogs that were not produced.

Let me say that I supported the Agricultural Adjustment Act. If I had it to do over again I would do precisely the same thing, but what I want to point out is this inconsistency, that we kill our own pork and make fertilizer out of it; that we take out 36,000,000 contract acres altogether and then we permit corn and oats to come from the Argentine; we permit rye to come from Poland and Latvia, and we permit barley malt to come in and we permit pork to come in from Canada. Now, there is no way of keeping it out at the present time unless we embargo these shipments. But does it make sense? Is it consistency, when we pay out \$195,000,000 to the farmers for reducing corn acreage and reducing the farrowings of hogs and then permit pork to come in from Canada?

Someone will say there is a compensating tax in the act. So there is. The compensating tax is equal to the processing tax that is imposed at the time it comes into this country. That would be 2½ cents, added to the duty, which is 5 cents altogether. With pork chops selling for 35 cents a pound how are you going to keep that pork out of this country and preserve our markets and our prices for our own farmers? With an aggregate of 5 cents for processing and compensating tax and so-called "duty", and no hog-reduction program in Canada, it will never keep that pork out. Consequently, you will find that ultimately the benefits we have sought to bestow upon the farmers of this country are going glimmering.

Mr. MOTT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. MOTT. The gentleman would like to keep out those products he has just mentioned?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Indeed.

Mr. MOTT. Does the gentleman know that the President at the present time has authority to embargo all those products and that he has never exercised that authority up to date?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I think that is true.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. MOTT. Does the gentleman know also that in addition to all these products that are coming in over the tariff wall, paying the tariff and still underselling our own farmers, that the President has taken off entirely the tariff on hay and straw from Canada and that these products come into the United States at the present time duty free?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Let us look at the complete development of this program and ascertain just why it was devised and

enacted into law. On May 12, 1933, the Agricultural Adjustment Act became law. It was an emergency measure, extending to wheat, corn, hogs, rice, tobacco, and milk products, for the purpose of raising prices, increasing the purchasing power of farmers, and effecting a parity between the prices they must pay for the things they purchase and the price they receive for their own commodities. I supported that measure.

The mechanics of the measure was quite simple. It authorized a processing tax to be imposed upon processed commodities, and this tax was to be used to reimburse farmers for curtailing production. In substance, it asked farmers to cooperate in reducing acreage and hog production, in return for which they were to receive a benefit and rental payment, which was collected from the consumers of the Nation.

Under this A. A. A. program the farmers of the Corn Belt "contracted" with Uncle Sam to take over 12,000,000 acres of corn land out of production in the 1934 crop year. The corn farmers also reduced their hog production. For this sacrifice of production the A. A. A. paid \$195,641,229 to the corn-hog farmers. Of this amount, more than twenty-four and one-half million dollars went to the farmers of Illinois. Our Illinois farmers also received a little less than \$4,000,000 for reducing wheat acreage.

Now, it occurs to me that a program which seeks to remedy a condition resulting from an alleged surplus by reducing the production of corn, hogs, wheat, and other commodities and paying for that reduction with public funds which were raised by a tax which is paid by every man, woman, and child in this country who can be considered as part of the consuming public, that everything possible would be done to maintain a consistent policy by preventing the importation of commodities in direct competition with those which we produce. It seems to me the very height of inconsistency to pay cash for reducing the number of hogs farrowed and then permit pork to come in from other countries. It seems to be the very acme of inconsistency to have purchased 6,200,000 little pigs and 220,000 brood sows in order to get them off of the market and then permit pork to enter from other countries. It seems to be the very essence of inconsistency to ask farmers to reduce their corn acreage by 20 percent and pay them 30 cents per bushel for the corn they might have raised and then permit corn to come in from other countries. It seems wholly inconsistent to ask our farmers to reduce their corn acreage and pay them for so doing and then permit products which can be used to displace corn to come in from other nations. It seems not only inconsistent but also unfair to our farmers and our consumers.

To be specific, a full shipload, consisting of 3,000,000 bushels of corn from the Argentine landed at Baltimore on February 25, just 40 miles from the Nation's Capital. On March 6 the steamship *Marcella* arrived in New York from the Argentine bearing 6,000 tons of corn. Recently several million pounds of pork have been shipped to us from Canada, and you can believe it or not, but it was reported to me on March 9 that a shipment of Argentine corn is expected to arrive in Peoria, Ill., soon, in the very heart of the Corn Belt. Similarly, rye from Poland and Latvia, wheat from Canada, and oats from the Argentine have been brought into the United States. As these shipments of grain and pork tend to increase, they will offset and negative the benefits of the A. A. A. to the farmer, who in good faith cooperated to reduce the so-called "surplus" in the hope of stimulating prices.

I assumed also that if we asked the farmer to reduce production, something would be done to preserve his industrial market. It seems to be an act of sheerest folly to say to the farmer, "We are asking you to reduce your corn acreage because we have too much corn. By reducing your corn production, supply and demand will balance each other and the price will go up. But we will leave the back door open so that such commodities as tapioca starch and blackstrap molasses, which displace corn in industry, can continue to enter." What nonsense is this? Hundreds of millions of pounds of tapioca flour, which is used in the manufacture of adhesives, sizing for textiles, and so forth, came in last

year duty free and robbed our farmers of a large portion of their industrial market. Blackstrap molasses, which comes from Cuba, Puerto Rico, and other offshore islands under a duty of only three one-hundredths of 1 cent per pound of sugar content, continues to enter at the rate of hundreds of millions of gallons annually and displaces corn in the manufacture of alcohol. In fact, of the 142,000,000 gallons of industrial alcohol produced in 1932, less than 5 percent was made from corn. Yet we place a tax on the consumers and ask the farmer to curtail his acreage because we produce too much.

It may be of interest to recite what the prevailing duties are on imported agricultural products. The rates are as follows: Corn, 25 cents per bushel; barley, 20 cents per bushel; barley malt, 40 cents per 100 pounds; oats, 16 cents per bushel; rye, 15 cents per bushel; wheat, 42 cents per bushel. Live cattle, $2\frac{1}{2}$ to 3 cents per pound; frozen and chilled beef and veal, 6 cents per pound; live hogs, 2 cents per pound; fresh, chilled, or frozen pork, $2\frac{1}{2}$ cents per pound; bacon, hams, and shoulders, $3\frac{1}{4}$ cents per pound; lard, 3 cents per pound; eggs, 10 cents per dozen. How are you going to prevent pork, corn, oats, and other competitive products from entering this country and destroying the benefits to farmers as a result of curtailment of production with such duties?

The Argentine had 42,000,000 bushels of corn available for export which it could send to this country because of a favorable price. In addition to that a new crop of Argentine corn will be available in April, and if the price remains favorable, it is to be expected that further imports of corn will enter this country and serve to put a capstone on the prices that the farmer will receive.

It has been said that these imports are necessary to take care of our feed requirements. That contention cannot be true of blackstrap molasses imported from plantations in Cuba controlled by certain sugar interests in New York; it cannot be true of tapioca flour and tapioca starch; it cannot be true of pork products. It could be true only of corn and feed wheat. With respect to pork products, it seems strange that there occurs on the floor of this House at least several speeches per week lamenting the loss of our agricultural export markets. What have the lamenters to say about the fact that the greatest corn- and hog-producing nation in the world, the one domain in which we are and have been supreme, is now importing corn and pork. But how can we justify the importation of corn even for feeding purposes? To admit that there is a feed shortage means that the farmers have failed to raise a feed crop which would be the same as money to them. It offers even more reason why they must be fully protected on the little they did raise, and to permit imports of corn and pork to enter and depress prices is at complete variance with the whole A. A. A. scheme for effecting parity prices for our farmers.

If you refer to the Corn-Hog Adjustment Handbook prepared by Mr. A. G. Black, Chief of the Corn-Hog Section of the A. A. A., note that on page 5 he states, "livestock feed requirements in 1935 would certainly be considerably below average", and that "the total number of hogs to be fed for slaughter during the 1934-35 marketing season beginning on October 1 would be at least 30 percent below the 2-year average." Mr. Black also ventures the observation that "corn prices were relatively high because of a moderate reduction in corn supplies", and then on page 58 states that "in fact, many of the emergency crops planted were more drought resistant than corn and produced more feed than corn would have produced."

If in Mr. Black's own words there is a "moderate" reduction of corn supplies and a considerably lower requirement of livestock feed, it seems difficult to justify these importations of corn unless there seems to be a desire to favor some geographical section of the country at the expense of the Corn Belt farmers.

We are up against a few stark and disagreeable facts. Drought, together with reduction and curtailment programs, have sent prices sky-high. The consumer is beginning to complain bitterly, particularly so since wages have not gone

up and the cost of necessities is out of proportion to the size of the pay check. The result is consumer resistance against high prices, which in turn is reflected in diminished sales. This causes the packer to complain. Importations of pork and other products will have a tendency to check or even lower farm prices for these commodities, giving the farmer a just cause for complaint, because he has already made his sacrifices for the benefits that he now hopes to enjoy and which were abundantly promised to him. Moreover, while gross farm income has risen, the farmer has been compelled to pay higher prices for what he buys by virtue of the effect of N. R. A., and once more we get into the vicious circle of seeking a balance and not knowing precisely where to begin. Considering that many of our farmers harvested only a half or a third of a crop of corn, prices for corn could well be higher than they are at the present time before the farmer can develop any real purchasing power.

This is equally true in the case of wheat. From July 1933 until March 1934 the North Pacific Emergency Export Association exported more than 16,000,000 bushels of wheat which it purchased at domestic prices and sold at world prices. The difference was 26 cents per bushel, and this difference was made up by the Government of the United States. Consider this fact of using Government money in order to get this wheat out of the country with the fact that we imported about 34,000,000 bushels of wheat in 1934 and that at this very moment there is stored in bond, on which no duty has yet been paid, approximately 21,000,000 bushels of imported wheat.

Grain production for 1934 plus the stocks we had on hand appear sufficient for our needs; and to permit importations of grain and pork at the expense of the American farmer, instead of effecting a proper distribution of the grain we now have from areas that have more than enough to areas that do not have enough, is short-sighted, inconsistent, and unfair to the American farmer and the American consumer alike.

If we really wish to serve the farmer and the consumer, let us quit lamenting the loss of an export market and preserve the market that is right at our door.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GILCHRIST].

Mr. GILCHRIST. Mr. Chairman, I wish the distinguished young gentleman from Illinois could have had more time, because he might then have pointed out that corn is not only being imported from Argentina but that it is coming to us also from China, Belgium, Rumania, and Kwantung, Mexico, Yugoslavia, Cuba, the Dominican Republic, and South Africa. It has been flowing with ease over our 25 cents a bushel tariff walls; and now there reaches this country about 1,000,000 bushels per week, according to press reports. Of course, this reflects in the markets which the farmers have at their disposal.

But I rise for a moment to talk about the seed-loan provisions of this bill. I am glad to know that crop-production loans are being taken care of. I hold in my hand a letter from one of the county agents in my district showing how necessary it is for them to have these seed loans; and I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include therein portions of this letter.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GILCHRIST. The letter referred to is dated March 7, 1935, and is from Mr. Paul A. Johnson, county agricultural agent in Crawford County, Iowa, and is in part as follows:

* * * our county with its rather high land values and large quantity of livestock has been hard hit by 2 years of drought, and both producers and landlords are hard up. We have over 400 in the county on relief work who have registered as farm laborers or farmers.

In regard to feed and seed loans: We have received at our office some 180 applications for emergency feed loans. About 65 have gone through already. These are lifesavers to our farmers who are out of feed and credit. We expect to have between 500 and 600 applications for seed loans. Farmers have requested here some 31,000 bushels of Government seed oats. Ninety percent will have to be settled for by seed loans.

We have had reported to us some livestock starving to death where feed loans were not completed in time. We are going to have a tight squeeze on many farms to get through to grass. I cannot see why they are holding up the seed loans. Every day brings us nearer spring. Farmers should be getting their seed now and know their plans. We are going to have one grand scramble and pile-up here in making these loans and getting seed distributed. We surely appreciate your efforts for us * * *.

Mr. Chairman, there is no time to lose. These loans must be forthcoming at once. The statements made in the foregoing letter have been confirmed by Mr. Ernest Ullerick, chairman of the Farm Bureau out there, who tells me that the farmers in his county must have these loans in order to farm their land this spring.

I want the committee to know that Iowa seldom has a devastating drought, but last year there was an unprecedented lack of rainfall along the western fringe of Iowa and in the southwest part of the State. That drought was so intense that many of the farmers for the first time in history must now have some relief for seed and feed loans, and some of us have interested ourselves in this bill to see that they will be able to get them.

The county referred to is very productive and fruitful and produces and feeds a great number of livestock and cattle. Even last year Crawford County feeders shipped 69 carloads of prize cattle to the Chicago International Livestock Show. The 4-H clubs there have won many prizes at this great exposition. I am sure that these people will be able to repay to the Government the loans which we are about to make to them. We will lose nothing from this locality, and the whole country will derive great benefit from this particular section of the bill. [Applause.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. LEMKE].

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Chairman, I am in accord with most of the provisions of this bill, but I wish to speak for a few minutes on the question of the farm-seed loans.

The fact is that these farm-seed loans are generally made available to the distressed farmers after the seeding time is past. This is particularly the true situation in the Northwest, with which I am familiar. In the making of these loans there are altogether too many restrictions and requirements never intended by Congress but made by some pencil pusher in the Farm Credit Administration who has nothing else to do but to lie awake nights to figure out new requirements for the distressed farmers. There is altogether too much passing of the buck and making of investigations, so that in many cases, when the bureaucrats get through investigating the farmer's financial standing, his politics, his religion, and his marital relations, the time for seeding is past.

The farmers, however, in a vain attempt to provide for absolute necessities, and in desperation, take this seed and plant it, although it is too late, and everyone feels that the chances for a crop are gone. That is why these farmers come back each year asking for more seed, and that is why many farmers have not paid back these seed loans, because they got them too late and did not get a crop, and for that reason could not pay. In many cases, when the crops are planted too late, the farmer does not get back even the seed that he puts in the ground, and if it were not for his desperation his better judgment would tell him not to plant it.

It is for this reason that I shall offer an amendment to this bill when it is read that, on page 4, line 19, after the figures "1935", the following words shall be added:

Such loans to farmers for crop production to be made with expedition, and without the usual redtape and delay, and without unreasonable restrictions and requirements, under unnecessary technical rules and regulations.

This will suggest to the Farm Credit Administration that Congress intends to provide feed and seed in seasonable time for the unfortunate farmers in the drought-stricken areas—and that it "don't mean maybe."

The undisputed fact remains that ever since Congress has provided for feed and seed loans, many distressed farmers throughout the Middle West were unable and did not get

these loans until seeding time was practically over. Then, in the vain hope that they might still get some kind of crop, they obtained these loans, expended their labor, and put the seed in the ground, but the result was that they harvested no crops, even though in some years the rainfall was ample and climatic conditions favorable for a good crop, had the seed been planted in time.

This amendment that I intend to offer is particularly applicable because of the late time at which this bill is being passed—seeding time is upon us, and I sincerely hope that the Chairman of the Appropriations Committee will not object to it. The amendment does not add any expense to the carrying out of the provisions of the bill, but it will cut down the useless restrictions and expenditures of investigations. It simply directs the Farm Credit Administration, charged with the responsibilities of carrying out the provisions of this bill, not to make rules and regulations too difficult or impossible of prompt compliance. For instance, under present regulations, if you are a farmer in North Dakota, and have a mortgage on part of your stock, or on your crop, you cannot get a loan unless you obtain a release from your mortgagee. Again, if you are a tenant, you are required to get a waiver from your landlord. The mortgagee or the landlord may live somewhere in the East, and by the time you correspond back and forth, and get the waiver, it is too late—planting time has passed. I sincerely hope that when this bill is read, the Committee will accept this amendment.

Mr. LUDLOW. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEMKE. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. LUDLOW. I appreciate the gentleman's solicitude for his people out in North Dakota, but may I ask if he is of the opinion that he can abolish redtape by statute? I have had a lot of contact with Government redtape during the last 40 years, and he has got to show me.

Mr. LEMKE. Yes; I am fully aware of the fact that it is a pretty hard thing to abolish redtape in the bureaucracy that we have established here in Washington. But I still feel that if we will impress the fact upon some of these men in charge of the various departments that when Congress passes a law it intends to have its provisions administered in such a manner as to carry out its intention, that we may get some prompt results. I realize that the men making these rules and regulations act in good faith, and know no better. Some of these have never been west of the Mississippi River, and do not realize the situation that exists in the drought-stricken areas. Let us give them a mandate that they eliminate all redtape, which I am sure will do some good.

May I state to you that we had the same delay and redtape in connection with feeding the starving cattle this winter? Out in my State we have had abundant rain and snow lately, which is very encouraging, but if any Member of this House will go to North Dakota, I will guarantee that he will see hay and straw stacked mountain high at many railway stations, and yet it is an indisputable fact that thousands of head of cattle have starved to death this winter because, under the existing redtape, the farmers could not get this hay or straw to feed their stock. We imported it from Canada and paid high prices, and then because of redtape the farmers could not get it, and their horses and cattle starved to death.

I have already seen a letter from the State Federal Emergency Relief Administrator of North Dakota stating that there undoubtedly would be some of this hay and straw left on their hands when the need for it is over, and the cattle, horses, and other livestock have starved to death. He is already building up an alibi by stating that if they had had a severe winter they would have had a shortage of hay and straw. There was, and there is, no excuse for having imported this feed at the expense of the taxpayers of this Nation for the purpose of assisting the drought-stricken farmers and then permitting their livestock to starve to death.

I may also state for the information of the Members of the House that the Agricultural Rehabilitation Corporation is now making arrangements to sell livestock, such as horses,

cattle, hogs, and poultry, to these distressed farmers, in place of that which, because of the redtape practiced by the bureaucracy, starved to death; and this, again, at the expense of the taxpayers of this Nation. If we had instructed them heretofore how this money was to be expended, without redtape, if we had used a little of the "hell-and-maria" language of Charles G. Dawes, we perhaps could have saved this shameful situation. First, we import hay and straw at high prices from Canada, then we deliberately permitted the livestock to starve and the hay and straw to rot, and then we replace the starved livestock by making new loans to these unfortunate farmers, exacting new mortgages from them.

Mr. Chairman, I sincerely hope the Members realize the situation. I feel the least we can do is to give these men, charged with the responsibility of carrying out the provisions of this appropriation, to understand that we want this money used for the purpose for which it is appropriated at once. At present, when we go up to the Farm Credit Administration and complain of the redtape, delays, restrictions, and requirements, they tell us: "Why, you men in Congress pass these laws, and we have to do these things in order to protect the money, and be sure it is all paid back." You want these matters handled along sound and business-like lines, when every Member knows that when we make these appropriations, we do not expect that all of it will be paid back, and that we do not desire all this redtape and restrictive rules and regulations.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I want to speak to the committee for a few minutes on two or three matters in this bill, and on one matter outside the bill. I will take up one or two general matters first.

There has grown up on the part of the Budget a habit of sending down here consolidated appropriations where they take the items for salaries, for operating expenses, and supplies and throw them together, so that they are able to manipulate the thing around and get along without turning any money back to the Treasury, if there is any to turn back. This habit has been growing and growing. With the independent offices and the new establishments that we have been creating in the last couple of years it has become a habit.

Mr. Chairman, I am very much opposed to this consolidation of appropriations, especially where salaries, operating expenses, and supplies are grouped, because it tends to destroy the Budget system and to create extravagance. That habit is especially strong with our new organizations. In one of the items in this bill it shows up where a new organization is starting in just that way. I refer to the archives outfit. There are a tremendous number of these independent establishments of the Government that are not budgeted so that we can properly control their operations through Congress. We have had the question raised by the operation of the Budget in submitting estimates this year, and we are in shape so that we can go down the line and get ready for it. I am serving notice now that next year, unless the Budget submits these things in proper shape so that the Congress can control the operations and appropriations for these departments, I am going to offer an amendment to every single page of every bill where that consolidation is apparent. I want that practice stopped, and I want to see the Congress get away from that sort of thing.

The reappropriations, the supplemental appropriations, and the deficiency appropriations involved in this bill run to approximately \$175,000,000. It is my opinion, based on rumors I have been receiving, that of the ordinary expenditures of this Government we are going to have deficiencies, supplemental appropriations, and reappropriations of a half billion dollars in connection with the ordinary establishments of the Government before this Congress adjourns for the fiscal year 1935, and a much larger amount for the fiscal year 1936. It is a tremendous amount. It shows that the economy program of the administration, if there ever was one, has broken down completely.

The Post Office Department is calling for a deficiency of \$3,000,000 for 1935. This \$3,000,000 will add to the deficit which the Postmaster General estimated for the fiscal year 1935. The deficit in that Department, if you take everything into consideration, is going to be \$35,000,000 or \$40,000,000 for the year 1935.

Mr. Chairman, I want to take up for a minute or two the Archives Establishment. We are carrying for that Department in this bill approximately \$500,000. They have set up a tremendous establishment. That establishment was set up and the outfit created for the purpose of preserving old and valuable documents belonging to the Government and providing a place where scholars may have access to those documents. The outfit they have set up, I believe, is entirely too large. I believe that they could get along with 75 percent of what they have set up, and I believe, after they have made an inventory of the things they want to take over, they could cut it a great deal more. On top of that they are reaching out.

May I call the attention of the committee to a couple of bills that have been introduced which relate to this organization. In the first place, there is H. R. 5703, introduced by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KELLER], which provides that the Superintendent of Documents shall furnish without cost copies of such past publications as may be required for official use by the National Archives establishment. This provision is so broad that they could go to almost any limit without appropriation by Congress. I want to avoid seeing this outfit set up into an organization for the distribution of pamphlets.

Mr. ARNOLD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ARNOLD. The bill which the gentleman has just referred to has not been enacted into law?

Mr. TABER. No; but I am calling attention to it now so that Members may be on their guard against that sort of thing.

Mr. ARNOLD. I understand the gentleman.

Mr. TABER. That is my object. I do not want to see this Department built up to the point where it is going to be a menace instead of an asset, and I think the gentleman is of the same frame of mind.

Mr. Chairman, I want to see the old documents of the Government properly preserved, but I do not want to see this outfit turned into a pamphlet-distributing proposition. We have already set up in the Government Printing Office a Superintendent of Documents who is trained for this purpose and who has a staff that is trained in this work. He is able to efficiently handle that sort of thing. We should not set up a duplicating outfit, providing them with free pamphlets, and put them in the situation where they will not have to come before the Appropriations Committee and ask for the funds with which they are to operate. I do not like to see these automatic and permanent appropriations which run into a lot of money and which costs the country a lot of money. This should never be allowed.

Mr. MICHENER. To which bill does the gentleman refer?

Mr. TABER. I am referring to the Keller bill now. I am going to refer to the Celler bill in a moment.

Mr. MICHENER. The gentleman is not referring to the Celler bill now?

Mr. TABER. I was not, but I am going to refer to it.

Mr. MICHENER. I hope the gentleman will know more about it.

Mr. TABER. I know something about both of them. I have read both of them.

The Celler bill provides that this outfit shall have charge of gathering together and distributing the regulations and the laws with reference to the alphabetical organizations in the country.

This is a good thing and it ought to be done, but it ought not to be done by this organization, because this is an organization not for the distribution of pamphlets, and not primarily equipped with the tools and the personnel to gather together such things. The job ought to be done under the Department of Justice and the distribution of these pam-

phlets ought to be under the Superintendent of Documents in the Government Printing Office, without duplication and without the extra expense to which we would otherwise have to go.

Mr. KELLER. What is the number of the Celler bill?

Mr. TABER. H. R. 6323. I am not quarreling about the work that is provided for in the Celler bill being done, because it is something that should be done, but, in my opinion, this outfit is not the one to do the work.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of the time.

I now want to talk about one other thing that has not any relationship to the bill and which, to my mind, is a matter of a great deal of importance.

There is agitation going on in foreign circles designed to bring about a loan to China of \$100,000,000. I am one of those Americans who has come to believe that we should not lend any more money to foreign countries. [Applause.]

In last Saturday's Herald Tribune of the 9th there was a long article telling of the lay-out; and prior to that, on the 7th, Mr. Phillips, the Under Secretary of State, was asked about it and he advised that this proposition is under consideration.

I realize that China's economic condition is in a deplorable state, due to the operations of our Treasury Department here in purchasing silver; but I cannot see any legitimate reason why we should be a party to lending all or any part of \$100,000,000 to China, so that we can be involved per force in that web which is coming as a result of the oriental conflict which is almost irrepressible. We should keep out of foreign entanglements and we should not be sticking our nose in and becoming a party to lending all or a part of \$100,000,000 to China and get ourselves involved in something that is not any of our business. [Applause.]

I am saying this because I hope that some such statement on the part of some of our citizenship will prevent the State Department from getting involved in this kind of situation. I hope it may be effective.

Mr. DUNN of Pennsylvania. Would the gentleman be opposed to lending China \$100,000,000 if it were to feed the hungry people over there?

Mr. TABER. I would want to know what was going on and how the thing was going to work, and I would not fix it so that some other power would get the money.

Mr. SHORT. Have we not plenty of hungry people over here to feed?

Mr. TABER. Well, they are not important in the eyes of the new deal. All we need to do is to get them on relief. We only have 22,000,000 on relief now.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to my colleague the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM].

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], speaking of the method in which Budget items are submitted, complained about the habit which he says has recently grown up of submitting lump-sum estimates.

The gentleman has been on the Appropriations Committee longer than I, but if my recollection serves me correctly, and I think I am accurate, I do not think there is any different system now in submitting items in the Budget than there has been all the time.

Mr. TABER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM. Certainly.

Mr. TABER. There has been a marked increase along that line so far as my observation goes.

Mr. WOODRUM. It may be that in the inauguration of new activities where it is impossible to specify every item in a particular appropriation that it has been necessary to submit it in a lump sum. But we have had lump-sum appropriations right along all the time.

Mr. TABER. But here in the Treasury Department bill and in the Post Office bill we had a very large number of items or estimates submitted by the Budget for which there was no justification at all.

Mr. WOODRUM. I am somewhat in accord with the gentleman, but the gentleman must remember that when these appropriations carry lump sums, such as those for archives for 1936, there has been submitted by the Bureau of the Budget to the Appropriations Committee the most detailed specific estimates as to what every penny of that money is to be used for. It has been submitted to the Budget; the position of every clerk, his salary, the length of time, every item of supplies to be purchased, and every other specific detail. Those items have been submitted to the Budget and to the Appropriations Committee, and have come under the scrutiny of the members of the Appropriations Committee, and you will find them in the hearings.

Mr. SNELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM. Gladly.

Mr. SNELL. Can the gentleman give us the whole cost of the Archives Department?

Mr. WOODRUM. Does the gentleman mean annual?

Mr. SNELL. Yes.

Mr. WOODRUM. I am going to give that in a moment. My friend must recognize the fact that this being a deficiency-appropriation bill—and he seems to express some apprehension and concern about a large deficit that we are going to have—I want to make this statement, subject to correction if there can be a correction, that there is not a single penny in this bill which increases the expenditure for the next fiscal year beyond the expenditures set up in the Budget which has been submitted to Congress.

THE NATIONAL ARCHIVES

Now, my friend, the gentleman from New York, made particular mention of the National Archives. I want to take a moment or two of my time to say something about that, not only for our own information, but for the information of those people who may be sufficiently interested in it to read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The establishment of the National Archives in 1934 brought into operation an activity and an agency of government which had been under careful consideration for 124 years and which had been the effort or ambition of every administration since 1878. When you examine the record, it is amazing.

It is generally assumed that the movement for a national archives establishment was started in 1878 with a recommendation made by the Secretary of War for the erection of a hall of records for the preservation of Government archives. However, that official interest in our national archives and concern for their preservation dates back to the earliest days of the Republic is shown by a study of the early records of Congress. As early as 1810 under the leadership of Josiah Quincy of Massachusetts a committee of the House of which Quincy was chairman was appointed to inquire into the state of the ancient records and archives of the United States, and what measures are necessary for the more safe and orderly preservation thereof. This committee after careful examination of the Government archives reported that "they find all the public records and papers, belonging to the period antecedent to the adoption of the present Constitution of the United States in a state of great disorder and exposure; and in a situation neither safe nor honorable to the Nation." The committee therefore recommended that provisions should be made without delay for the preservation and orderly arrangement of the national archives.

Accordingly a bill was introduced (H. R. 125, 11th Cong., 2d sess.) to carry out the recommendation of the committee. In the debate on this bill Quincy said that "he was desirous to pass the bill upon the ground that the public records of the country, of the War, Navy, and State offices, were in such a situation as was disgraceful to the House and to the Nation. Not only were they in disorder, and in a state of gradual decay; but all the records of the Revolutionary War lie under the eaves of this building in a condition extremely unsafe, and daily exposed to destruction by fire." The bill authorized the President to erect or purchase one additional Government building into which certain agencies should be removed from "the public building west of the President's

house"; and that this last-mentioned building should be reserved for the State, War, and Navy Departments, and that the President should have caused to be built therein "as many fireproof rooms as shall be sufficient for the convenient deposit of all the public papers and records of the United States, belonging to, or in the custody of the State, War, or Navy Departments." For this purpose an appropriation of \$20,000 was authorized. The bill passed both Houses, and received the approval of the President on April 28, 1810.

After this early evidence of congressional interest in the national archives, though the subject was frequently discussed, it does not appear to have received much further consideration by Congress until 1878.

I have in my hand, which I refer to, Senate Document 297 of the Sixty-second Congress, second session, presented by Senator Poindexter, which gives a history of the movement after that year. It sets out that before 1878 the construction of a National Archives Building was frequently proposed, "but not until that year was it formally brought to the attention of Congress." The Quartermaster General of the Army, in his annual report for 1878 called attention to the need for a "hall of records for preservation of the records of the executive departments not required for daily reference."

His suggestion was endorsed by the Secretary of War, and President Hayes, in his annual messages of 1878 and 1879, recommended to Congress favorable action on the Secretary's proposal "that provision be made for the erection of a fireproof building for the preservation of certain valuable records, now constantly exposed to destruction by fire."

That this danger of the destruction of valuable Government records was not a figment of the imagination is shown by a report of the fire marshal of the District of Columbia, printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD (vol. 53, pt. 14, p. 1113, ff., 64th Cong., 1st sess.), which lists from 1873 to 1915, inclusive, more than 250 fires on Government property within the District.

From 1878 down to the present, practically every session of Congress, every succeeding administration, and almost every succeeding Cabinet officer considered the subject of establishing in Washington some central depository where the archives of the Government of important national interest could be deposited and preserved.

In reviewing the number of bills introduced in Congress to provide for a National Archives Building, it would seem that few other public-building projects have aroused a greater degree of congressional interest and activity. From 1880 to date there have been 69 such bills introduced, of which 41 were Senate bills and 28 were House bills. These bills were sponsored by 40 different Senators and Representatives. A number of resolutions and amendments also were introduced, and a large number of reports upon the subject were made and published as official documents by both Houses of Congress. The proposal also received strong endorsements from the several Presidents since 1878.

In 1903, as a result of this long agitation covering a quarter of a century, Congress authorized the purchase of a site for a "hall of records" and appropriated for the purpose \$400,000. It directed the Secretary of the Treasury to have preliminary plans prepared for an Archives Building. The site was purchased in 1904 and tentative plans for the Archives Building were submitted to Congress in that year. In 1912 President Taft, in a message to Congress, said:

I cannot close this message without inviting the attention of Congress again to the necessity for the erection of a building to contain the public archives. The unsatisfactory distribution records, the lack of any proper index or guide to their contents, is well known to those familiar with the needs of the Government in this Capital. The land has been purchased and nothing remains now but the erection of a proper building.

As a result of this rapidly growing interest, Congress passed the Public Buildings Act of 1913, which provided a general public-buildings program; but the outbreak of the World War and perhaps other reasons delayed its execution. After the World War interest was revived, and in 1924 Senator Smoot, Chairman of the recently created Public

Buildings Commission, in a report to Congress, urged the need for a National Archives Building. Two years later the Public Buildings Act of 1926 was passed, which provided for a well-coordinated public-buildings program. Of this program Hon. Richard N. Elliott, Chairman of the House Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, said:

The passage of this act marked an epoch in the history of the public buildings of our country, for the reason that it was the beginning of the first comprehensive building program adopted by our Government.

In carrying out the provisions of this act, President Coolidge requested the Commission of Fine Arts to submit a report to the Director of the Budget on the need of a National Archives Building. Accordingly the Deficiency Appropriation Act, of July 1926, authorized an appropriation of \$6,900,000 for an Archives Building. This amount was increased by the Appropriation Act of 1928 to \$8,750,000. The building was now assured, plans were prepared, and ground was broken September 9, 1931. On February 19, 1932, the cornerstone was laid by President Hoover, who had taken a great interest in the project.

I say to my good friend from New York [Mr. TABER] that it was during the administration of his party that definite steps for the establishment of this great agency of government finally took shape, as in the arrangement of the buildings for the development of the Triangle they provided for the construction of the National Archives Building. In laying the cornerstone President Hoover said:

There is an especial significance to this ceremony, coming within 2 days of the celebration of George Washington's Birthday. The soil on which we are standing is part of the original tract acquired by President Washington for the Nation's Capital.

The building which is rising here will house the name and record of every patriot who bore arms for our country in the Revolutionary War, as well as those of all later wars. Further, there will be aggregated here the most sacred documents of our history—the originals of the Declaration of Independence and of the Constitution of the United States.

Here will be preserved all the other records that bind State to State and the hearts of all our people in an indissoluble Union. The romance of our history will have living habitation here in the writings of statesmen, soldiers, and all the others, both men and women, who have builded the great structure of our national life.

This temple of our history will appropriately be one of the most beautiful buildings in America, an expression of the American soul. It will be one of the most durable, an expression of the American character.

Devoutly the Nation will pray that it may endure forever, the depository of records of yet more glorious progress in the life of our beloved country. I now lay the cornerstone of the Archives Building and dedicate it in the name of the people of the United States.

In anticipation of the early completion of the building, the Seventy-third Congress placed the capstone on the work begun 124 years earlier by passing the National Archives Act of 1934 (Public, No. 432, 73d Cong.), approved June 19, 1934, by President Hoover's successor, President Franklin D. Roosevelt. The National Archives Establishment, therefore, is not the work of any political party; members of all parties, interested only in the safeguarding of priceless Government records and the preservation of our glorious history of which they are the evidences, have had a hand in its creation.

The National Archives Act provides for the appointment by the President of an Archivist of the United States and defines his powers and duties; it empowers him to set up an adequate staff and authorizes such appropriations as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of the act. I desire to quote here the Archivist's interpretation of the purposes of the act and his summary of its provisions, as set forth in his Budget justification presented to the House Appropriations Committee. It is as follows:

The act recognizes two fundamental objectives of the National Archives Establishment: (1) The concentration in a central depository of all the inactive archives of the Government of such administrative or historical value that they must be preserved over a long period of years, or permanently; (2) the administration of such archives so as to facilitate their use in the business of the Government and in the service of scholarship.

To enable the National Archives Establishment to attain these objectives the act places "under the charge and superintendence" of the Archivist of the United States "all the archives or records belonging to the Government of the United States (legislative,

executive, judicial, and other)" which shall be approved by the National Archives Council for transfer to the National Archives Building (see sec. 3, Archives Act), and requires him to perform the following duties and functions:

(1) To appoint all persons to be employed in the National Archives Establishment, except those with salaries of \$5,000 or over, who are to be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. (See sec. 2, Archives Act.)

(2) To inspect and appraise, personally or by deputy, the archives of any agency of the United States Government whatsoever and wheresoever located. (See sec. 3, Archives Act.)

(3) To requisition for transfer to and to store and preserve in the National Archives Building all archives or records approved for such transfer by the National Archives Council. (See sec. 3, Archives Act.)

(4) To make regulations for the arrangement, custody, use, and withdrawal of materials deposited in the National Archives Building. (See sec. 3, Archives Act.)

(5) To exercise immediate custody over and control of the National Archives Building and such other buildings, grounds, and equipment as may hereafter become a part of the National Archives Establishment (except as otherwise provided by law), and their contents. (See sec. 4, Archives Act.)

(6) To serve as Chairman of the National Historical Publications Commission in making plans, estimates, and recommendations for such historical works and collections of sources as seem appropriate for publication and/or otherwise recording at public expense. (See sec. 5, Archives Act.)

(7) To serve as a member of the National Archives Council, which is charged with the duty of defining what classes of archival material shall be transferred from the several agencies of the Government to the National Archives Building. (See sec. 6, Archives Act.)

(8) To provide for the acceptance, storage, and preservation of motion-picture films and sound recordings pertaining to and illustrative of the history of the United States and to maintain a projecting room for showing such films and reproducing such sound recordings for historical purposes and study. (See secs. 5 and 7, Archives Act.)

(9) To make recommendations to Congress regarding the disposal of useless papers and other documents among the archives and records of the Government. (See sec. 9, Archives Act.)

(10) To direct the expenditure of all appropriations for the maintenance of the National Archives Building and for the administration of the collections and other expenses of the National Archives Establishment and of the National Historical Publications Commission. (See sec. 10, Archives Act.)

The functions of the National Archives Establishment have been divided into four major activities: Two dealing mainly with internal matters (professional and administrative), and two dealing with external relations (historical publications and general public relations). This grouping is the result of careful studies and researches made in an endeavor to carry out the intent of Congress as expressed in the National Archives Act.

My friend from New York says that they are starting off too elaborately, that the National Archives is a new thing, and that they ought to go more carefully. It is not a new thing. Not an item of legislation that will be passed by this Congress has had more deliberate and careful thought and study than this one.

In 1930, President Hoover appointed a provisional committee for a national archives to make a survey of the archives of the Government to supply the architect with necessary data on which to base an estimate of the size and character of the building required to house them. This committee was composed of the following Government officials:

Department of State, Tyler Dennett, Historical Advisor.

Department of the Treasury, Louis A. Simon, Superintendent Architectural Division, Supervising Architect's Office.

Department of War, Brig. Gen. James F. McKinley, Assistant to The Adjutant General.

Department of the Interior, E. K. Burlew, Administrative Assistant to the Secretary.

Library of Congress, J. Franklin Jameson, Chief, Division of Manuscripts.

General Accounting Office, James L. Baity, Executive Officer.

On the basis of reports from the several executive departments and independent establishments this committee estimated the amount of documents, the number of personnel required for their administration, the cubic feet required to house them, and so on down the line, to the most careful detail.

The following is the committee's summary of the reports received:

Survey of provisional committee for a national archives

(Department or establishment: Master recapitulation; administrative unit: All Government departments and independent establishments)

	Character of material in cubic feet					
	(a) Document	(b) Flat	(c) Pamphlets	(d) Maps	(e) Indexes	(f) Total
1. Records to 1860.....	38,326.10	57,270.72	4,511.8	6,766.47	1,826.10	108,701.19
2. Records 1861 to 1916.....	247,283.09	488,872.15	124,204.31	33,576.68	29,318.26	923,254.49
3. Records 1917 to date.....	201,135.14	2,060,970.82	89,249.21	68,155.04	216,167.72	2,641,677.93
4. Total.....	486,744.33	2,613,113.69	217,965.32	108,498.19	247,312.08	3,673,633.61
5. Less records not of permanent or historical value.....	49,513.11	534,091.65	18,093.32	28,207.46	121,462.71	751,368.25
6. Total.....	437,231.22	2,079,022.04	199,872.00	80,290.73	125,849.37	2,922,255.36
7. Average annual increment for decade 1920-29.....	6,021.60	112,487.84	6,488.38	4,392.60	15,812.58	145,203.00
8. Estimated number of employees for records in lines (1) 35,854, (2) 103,781, (3) 417,907; total, 557,542.....						
9. Square feet of floor space now occupied by records in this file unit, 818,992.596.....						
10. Field records eventually to be transferred to Washington, D. C., 282,721.2 cubic feet.....						

¹ Plus 3,000 cubic feet foreign archives per year for the State Department.

Date: Oct. 2, 1930.

As a result of this information, the committee submitted a report upon which the arrangement of the space in the Archives Building was based. That report was filed November 11, 1930. It discusses the type of building desired, the form of organization and personnel that should be set up for the National Archives, and states that there will be a much smaller number of people working in this building than is usual in buildings of corresponding size. It points out that it is unlikely that the personnel employed in the completed structure will greatly exceed 600 people. This report is such an interesting and illuminating document that it ought to be preserved in permanent form. It is as follows:

ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON THE NATIONAL ARCHIVES BUILDING,
Washington, D. C., November 11, 1930.

PROGRAM PREPARED AS A BASIS FOR PRELIMINARY SKETCHES

The National Archives Building is intended to become the repository for all papers of the Federal Government which are considered worthy of permanent preservation or which for administrative reasons must be retained for a long period of years. The value of the various papers and files thus deposited will vary from such priceless documents as the original laws and original treaties of the United States to vast quantities of papers which in themselves would appear to be relatively unimportant were it not for the relation which they bear to larger questions. The completed building for the National Archives is not designed as a central filing depot for active files but for papers that have ceased to be related to current business.

To this institution will come, not only the various agencies of the Federal Government which desire to verify information or to trace the continuity of policies, but there will also come historical scholars from both the United States and foreign countries. It is probable that at least for the next half century the number of students for whom facilities for work will have to be provided will be relatively small as compared with the number of persons connected with the Federal Government who will come into the building from other Government offices in connection with current governmental work. On the other hand, many scholars are likely to make prolonged visits and should be provided with all reasonable facilities for the prosecution of their searches.

The site which has been designated for the National Archives being in the center of Washington, a building so placed would afford opportunity to make accessible to the general public exhibits of documents illustrating the various phases of the progress and development of the American Nation. The performance of this function of popular education must be so controlled that it will in no way interfere with the normal operation of the building in connection with current Government work nor should the exhibits be so arranged and managed as in any way to increase the hazard of destruction either by fire, theft, or the handling of fragile papers.

In order to maintain the functional divisions of the building, the following major divisions of plan occur: (1) Administration and operation; (2) stacks; (3) public space, and (4) circulation, public and private.

TYPE OF BUILDING

In the table of space requirements given in this program it became necessary to depart somewhat from what would theoretically be the most desirable form of building in order to meet the requirements for the architectural development of the so-called "Triangle."

It is expected that the bulk of archives initially to be deposited in the building will be relatively small, that there will be periodic transfers at intervals of perhaps 5 years, and that there will be additional transfers from time to time of quantities of papers which, while of relatively recent date, are no longer considered important or current. It is estimated that the total bulk of all

of the records of the Government worthy of permanent preservation up to January 1, 1917, exceeds slightly 1,000,000 cubic feet, from which it is estimated that a total of 3,500,000 cubic feet of stack space will be sufficient to house all records of the Government prior to that date.

It is further estimated that the files of the Government which accumulated between January 1, 1917, and January 1, 1930, form approximately twice the bulk of all files for the earlier period. When all files of the Government prior to January 1, 1930, shall have been deposited in the building the total stack space required will be between nine and ten million cubic feet, with the possibility that this requirement may be increased by the occasional transfers of other papers of relatively recent date. Furthermore, the anticipated annual accumulation of 200,000 cubic feet per year will create a demand for increases of stack space at the rate of 600,000 cubic feet per year.

As a working basis it has been assumed that the capacity of a building designed to conform to the requirements of the so-called "Triangle" group would be limited to about 10,000,000 cubic feet, although some 60 percent of this is not likely to be required within the next half century.

The purposes which the National Archives Building are to serve are such that the planning thereof is subject to certain basic conditions which are mandatory and call for directness and simplicity of arrangement.

The fact that the ultimate space requirements to accommodate all the archives of the Federal Government far exceed the ultimate capacity of the main Archives Building placed on the site chosen within the Triangle area calls for a building with a very concentrated arrangement of stacks. Such an arrangement is made possible by the desirability of excluding from the stack units all natural light and outside atmosphere and supplying artificial light and conditioned air.

The fact indicated above that less than 50 percent of the building's ultimate capacity will be required for the first 50 years after it is first occupied must be taken into consideration in the conception of the design. The space requirements as given in this program are for the ultimate capacity of the building, and the preliminary sketches are to be governed accordingly. But the sketches must also indicate the means proposed for furnishing a building with from four to five million cubic feet capacity, which will probably remain of that size for 50 years after date of occupancy.

The possibility exists that a portion of what will ultimately be artificially lighted stack space might in the interim be naturally lighted for temporary use other than for stacks.

Insofar as the plan of the building is affected by the personnel to be accommodated, it should be noted that there will be a much smaller number of people working in the building than is usual in buildings of corresponding size. The subject of personnel is discussed below, but it is important here to point out that it is unlikely that the personnel employed in the completed structure will greatly exceed 600 people, and for the first 50 years a very much smaller number will be required for the efficient operation of the archives.

The personnel will be divided roughly into two groups:

(a) Those who work directly on the files and who should, therefore, be located as closely as possible to the papers upon which they work;

(b) The central administrative force which will be engaged in a variety of tasks enumerated below.

In the interests of efficient administration it is desirable that the relatively small administrative force should be located as closely together as is feasible. It is also desirable that the force which must work directly on the papers in searching, sorting, etc., shall have as favorable conditions as possible with reference to light and air. It is the further consideration that effective control of the stacks for the prevention of fire and for the safeguarding of the papers makes it desirable to exclude from the stack space all but those whose services are indispensable at that point.

With stack units arranged for artificial lighting and the introduction of conditioned air, there will be required relatively small workrooms adjacent to these stacks for the use of small groups of workers, where they may have direct access to the stacks in their charge with the minimum of delay. These centers should be located with reference to a convenient means of circulation to the main administrative unit, which will be located outside the stacks.

PERSONNEL

For the purpose of the preliminary sketches, it may be assumed that the organization of the personnel for the National Archives Building will have as its head an archivist with two principal assistants, one of whom will have general supervision of the archives work and the other of whom will be an executive assistant. The information office, the reference service, the cataloging units, and the search rooms will be operated by a relatively high-grade personnel with something equivalent to library training and experience.

There will be a considerable number of mechanical operations connected with the receiving, sorting, cleaning, repairing, and duplicating sections. These operations will require a more mechanically trained personnel, and their several functions are so similar as to suggest locating them close together, and they may be on a floor separated from the other personnel.

OPERATION

While it will no doubt be possible to arrange a schedule for transfers which will to some extent prevent the congestion incident to the delivery of very large quantities of papers at any one time, nevertheless, very ample provision should be made for the receiving of papers. The delivery of papers will be accompanied by the delivery of an inventory which will describe the papers at the moment being transferred. Before the inventory can be receipted for, it will be desirable to sort the deliveries, place them in order on the receiving floor in such a way that each item of the inventory can be checked off and receipted for and there should, therefore, be provision on the receiving floor for a large amount of shelving similar in character to that which will go into the stacks. Probably all files will be sorted and given their original and permanent classifications on the receiving floor before they are transferred to their permanent resting place in the stacks.

It is also contemplated that the papers before delivery to the stacks will be passed through a disinfecting and cleaning process which will kill all animal life and also remove to some extent the dirt. These two operations must be performed in space adjacent to the receiving floor.

After the documents have been once assigned to their place in the stacks, the principal calls which will be made for these papers will be broadly of the following characters:

- (1) The request to see a single paper or a small group of papers;
- (2) A request for information which will be supplied by the members of the archives staff after whatever search of the files by them is found to be necessary.
- (3) A request to conduct a search of a quantity of papers by one or more persons either from a Government office or from those representing a private interest.

It will be observed that these various kinds of requests call for two kinds of service:

- (1) An operation which can be performed entirely in the stacks or in the adjacent room of a stack supervisor.
- (2) An operation which involves the transfer of a group of papers to a general search room where the search can be conducted under the immediate supervision of qualified archives assistants, or to a room specially assigned to a group of searchers. Separate rooms for individual searchers will not be provided.

The subdivisions of the stack space will be generally by heavy removable wire partitions extending from floor to ceiling, except that there shall be fire walls at proper intervals throughout the stack space.

Among the documents deposited in the National Archives Building there will be papers which are not to be made available to the public or to any Government office except by the express permission from the head of the office having prior custody of the papers. Provision must be made in the stacks for segregating this class of documents. The wire partitions mentioned above would serve the purpose.

Aside from the principal calls received for various papers for examination, papers may be removed from the stacks in small quantities for other purposes, viz, repairing, binding, and rebinding. Such papers would be transferred under proper safeguards to the repair room, which should be located on the floor with the other mechanical operations.

Papers also might be transferred to the duplicating room, where photostats or photographs would be made. This, however, is a short operation, involving withdrawals from the shelves for very brief periods. The duplicating rooms should be located so that they can serve their functions with the least possible delay in order that the service required of the archives staff may be performed not only efficiently but with unflinching promptness. This will require facilities for very rapid and efficient duplicating.

In the functioning of the administrative units, the center of operations will be an information unit, which will be located completely outside of the stack space, where requests by telephone or in person will be received. Obviously, this should be conveniently located with reference to the public on the one hand and the stacks on the other. It should also be so designed as to be under close supervision of the archivist and his immediate staff.

To answer requests for information it will usually be necessary to refer to the catalog. The catalog will probably consist of little more than the various items of the inventory carded separately. On these cards will be noted the location in the stacks of the files which will have to be consulted. The requests for information will then be referred to the appropriate stack unit. This unit will have adjacent to the files themselves whatever indexes were originally transferred with the papers or are subsequently made.

If files are to be consulted by someone other than a member of the archives staff they will be brought down to a charge desk and then delivered to a designated desk in a search room.

It is contemplated that there will be for official purposes a general search room and two smaller rooms. There will be another search room for the nonofficial searches. The search rooms should be so planned that additional search-room space can be provided as given in the space data.

Very many of the requests for information can be answered by reference to official publications of the Government. There is therefore provided a library which should be located as close as possible to the information unit. It is, however, not necessary that the library should be on the same floor with the information unit and search rooms. It might conveniently be placed directly above or directly below, in which case there will be required a means of direct communication by an inside stairway and an automatic lift or a small elevator.

The library will be primarily a collection of Government documents with an alcove arrangement of stacks. It should be so designed as to permit easy and rapid access to its shelves. It is not intended for use by the public, but is to be easily accessible to any of the reference staff of the archives administration, with ordinary safeguards employed to prevent the unauthorized withdrawal or misplacement of books.

The map collection of the Government, in charge of the Geographer, is very extensive and, because of the odd shapes of the maps, requires special treatment both as to shelving and as to reference service. Map files must be segregated from other files in the stacks and should be adjacent to the geographic section of the general administration. The geographic section in turn should be close both to the library and to the information office. The space for the Geographer will include provision for large tables and space for wall maps.

A distinction is to be made between the catalog which must be included in the information service and the process of catalog making which calls for cataloging unit. It may be accepted that, while many papers will be received with adequate indexes, there will be a great many papers which require further classification and cataloging. Some of this cataloging can be done under adequate supervision by the section units adjacent to the stacks, but a great deal of it will be handled in a central cataloging unit easily accessible to the stacks. This unit should be located as close as is possible to the information unit and the search rooms, since the catalogers are often in the best position to know the papers which may at any time be desired. If the library and the Geographer's office were to be located directly under the information unit and the search rooms, the cataloging unit might be located directly above the latter, thus providing the closest possible contiguity.

In view of the fact that the service rendered will center so largely in the information unit and the search rooms, it seems desirable for efficient administration that the Archivist and the Assistant Archivist be located on the same floor, possibly at one end of the administration portion of the building. The executive officer might be placed on one of the lower floors.

Very exceptional precautions will be necessary to protect the stacks from the common dangers of destruction, disintegration, and theft. To eliminate as far as possible the danger of damage by rats, mice, and vermin lunch rooms are to be provided, with the expectation that the most stringent regulations will be adopted to forbid the keeping of food of any kind in any other part of the building. The lunch rooms should be so located as to make it feasible to keep them scrupulously clean at all times. No provisions for cooking will be required.

Space requirements

ADMINISTRATION

	Square feet
Archivist:	
Private office	500
Secretary	300
Stenographers	300
Reception room (if possible serving also the Assistant Archivist and executive officer)	1,000
Private toilet, small vault	
Assistant Archivist:	
Office	500
Private toilet	
Secretary	300
(NOTE.—Waiting room, if not adjacent to reception room of Archivist.)	
Executive officer:	
Office	500
Private toilet	
Secretary	300
Information and clerical (this includes space for the catalog and is to be subdivided as required)	2,000
Vault	300

Space requirements—Continued

ADMINISTRATION—CONTINUED

Section chiefs:	Square feet
10 offices located adjacent to the stacks and on alternate decks, each office 400 square feet.....	4,000
Adjacent to each office, local catalog, each 400 square feet.....	4,000
Geographer.....	600
Accession records.....	600
Central cataloging unit.....	4,000
Receiving.....	25,000
Cleaning and fumigating.....	600
Repairing.....	1,200
Binding.....	1,200
Vault.....	200
Storage for supplies (near executive officer).....	400
Lunch room:	
Men (no kitchen required).....	800
Women (no kitchen required).....	800
Toilets:	
Men.....	---
Women.....	---
Duplicating unit (mimeographing, printing, etc.).....	600
Photographic unit.....	6,000
Mail room.....	500
Relief station.....	600
National Archives Council (use conference room of advisory committee).	
Advisory committee:	
Conference room.....	800
1 office.....	200
Commission on National Historical Publications (use conference room of advisory committee, 2 offices, each 200 square feet).....	400
Expansion.....	1,000

OPERATION

Superintendent of building:	
Office.....	400
Vault.....	100
Chief engineer: Office.....	400
3 assistant chief engineers: Office.....	300
Captain of the watch:	
Office.....	300
Guardroom (lockers).....	300
Maintenance shops:	
Plumbing and steam fitting.....	500
Carpenter.....	500
Cabinet.....	500
Electrical.....	500
Painting.....	500
Foreman of laborers.....	400
Mechanical equipment: Machinery, etc.....	12,000
General storage.....	2,000

OPERATING PERSONNEL

Day and night male laborers:	
Locker room.....	500
Toilet.....	---
Lunch room.....	400
Day and night female help:	
Locker room.....	500
Toilet.....	---
Lunch room.....	400
Mechanics:	
Locker room.....	500
Toilet and showers.....	---
Lunch room.....	400
Waste-paper room.....	800
Cleaning gear and cuspidor rooms each floor (100 square feet each).....	800

PUBLIC SPACE

1 general search room, official (bookcases on walls).....	1,000
2 search rooms for groups of officials, each 500 square feet.....	1,000
One search room, unofficial.....	1,000
Search-room expansion.....	2,000
Library.....	4,000
Librarian.....	600
Toilets:	
Men.....	---
Women.....	---
Exhibition room.....	1,200
Projection room.....	2,500
Corridors, elevators, etc., as required.	
Stacks: Solid partitions as required for fire protection, separations otherwise by wire-mesh partitions extending from floor to ceiling.	

Since this report was made, it has been found advisable to modify some of its recommendations and suggestions, but in every material respect it forms the basis of the plans of the Archivist upon which his budget is based.

President Hoover's committee, it will be noted, estimated that there are over 3,000,000 cubic feet of documents, important historical records relating to the activities of this

Government from its very founding. They are now scattered about the city in cellars, attics, basements, and many other similar unsuitable places where they are subject to the wear and tear of passing years and other destructive agencies. They must be gone over, they must be surveyed, they must be cleaned and fumigated, and many of them repaired, before they can be filed for permanent preservation in the National Archives Building.

The importance of these archives to the Nation is clearly set forth in a discussion of the National Archives by Mr. Waldo G. Leland (S. Doc. No. 717, 63d Cong., 3d sess.), from which I quote the following paragraph on page 5:

The archives of the Federal Government are composed of the letters, orders, reports, accounts, and other documents produced in the course of transacting the public business, whether located within the District of Columbia, or wherever the operations of the Government extend. The value of these archives may truly be said to be inestimable. In the transaction of current business those of recent date are in constant use, while those of earlier origin are frequently referred to. They constitute the chief protection of the State against unfounded or ill-founded claims. In international discussions or disputes they are the principal source from which arguments may be drawn to support the contentions of the Government. On them are based the titles to millions of acres of land and to thousands of patent rights. The actual money loss, to say nothing of the inconvenience, that would result to the Government, and to citizens as well, by the destruction of any considerable part of the Federal Archives, can hardly be calculated.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. Apropos of the attack made by our good friend from New York [Mr. TABER] on the archives set-up, is there not a law that prevents a parent from questioning the legitimacy of his own offspring?

Mr. TABER. But there is no law that prevents a parent from correcting his offspring.

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, I do not construe the remarks of the gentleman from New York so much as an attack as I do as somewhat of a criticism, and I think it is meant to be constructive, but I think it is not a wise criticism. In my judgment there is no more important thing that we can do than to carry out this great activity, and in this material day, when we are thinking so much of material things, let us not lose altogether our spiritual values and perspective. [Applause.]

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM. Yes.

Mr. LUDLOW. The gentleman is making a very interesting and scholarly presentation of the historical aspects of the National Archives Establishment, and I am sure all of us are enjoying it; but I should like to ask him to address himself to the suggestion of the gentleman from New York in regard to whether it should be used as a distributing agency.

Mr. WOODRUM. The gentleman is correct, and I am very glad he called my attention to that. My friend from New York quite properly says that he does not want to see the National Archives turned into an agency to distribute pamphlets. That has not been suggested by anyone. The gentleman referred to the Keller bill—H. R. 5703. The Keller bill does not suggest that the National Archives distribute pamphlets. My friend has not read the bill carefully. It provides merely for the distribution of Government publications to the National Archives "for its own use and for international exchange." There is not a word in the Keller bill which, under the wildest stretch of the imagination, could permit the National Archives to distribute pamphlets. If the gentleman can find it, let him read it. The author of the bill is sitting before me. The purpose of the bill is to permit the National Archives to receive Government publications, just as they are received by many other official governmental agencies.

Mr. TABER. That is one proposition, but the other proposition is this, and it is quite broad: The Superintendent of Documents shall furnish without cost copies of such past publications as may be required for official use by the National Archives Establishment.

Mr. WOODRUM. Why, of course.

Now, what is said there about the National Archives distributing pamphlets? They are for the official use of the National Archives in their library. Nobody has ever had any idea of distributing pamphlets. Here is a great Government institution, the official purpose of which is to house the archives of the Government. The great majority of such Government publications, if not all, are themselves archives of the highest importance. If there is any one place in the United States that ought to have a complete set of Government publications it is the National Archives. My friend has just drawn upon his imagination. I can say to him and to the House and to the country that the Archivist has no intention of distributing pamphlets, but he does need a complete set of Government publications in his library for the efficient functioning of the National Archives. Such at least is the experience of the archives establishments of other governments, including not only those of European countries but also those of the various States of this Union which have established such agencies.

Mr. TABER. I am of the opinion that the National Archivist could go a long way in getting into the other business under that language.

Mr. WOODRUM. My friend is unduly apprehensive. He has also referred to the Celler bill, H. R. 6323. I am not perfectly familiar with the detailed provisions of the Celler bill, but I am in sympathy with its general purpose.

Mr. CELLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM. I yield.

Mr. CELLER. I am able to explain the purposes of the bill, which is on the Consent Calendar awaiting the action of the House. The object of that bill is to prepare for the codification of all rules and regulations of all departments. Let me state that, for example, in the National Industrial Recovery Act there are some 11,000 pages of rules and regulations, and hardly anyone knows where all of them are. Some of them take the form of issues on mere tissue paper. Others became regulations as a result of a telegram sent to somebody in some far-distant office. Still others are mimeographed. There is no real codification, for example, of the regulations of that one bureau.

The post-office regulations comprise three volumes that are just literally loaded with obsolete regulations, which have no longer any force or effect. The Veterans' Administration has volumes of regulations. Many of them have been repealed and cross-repealed. Even those in the office of the Veterans' Administration are oftentimes in doubt as to the legal import of literally hundreds of those regulations. We now propose by this bill to have the Archivist be the responsible custodian of all rules and regulations when they shall have been codified by those in the Attorney General's office, properly selected and qualified to do the job.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] has expired.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. CELLER. Shall I continue briefly?

Mr. WOODRUM. Yes; briefly.

Mr. CELLER. It covers 2 angles, in this sense: One provides for the codification of all past rules and regulations and the other provides for the codification and issuance of a Federal register for all future rules and regulations, so that anybody interested may lay his hands upon the proper rule or regulation. Provision is made that Members of Congress and the Senate and others, of course, interested in the matter shall receive a copy of the daily register so that they shall know exactly what is happening in the various bureaus and departments.

Mr. MICHENER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM. I yield briefly.

Mr. MICHENER. I am a member of the same committee as the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER]. There is one inherent defect in that bill, and the same inherent defect was in the bill establishing the archives set-up, that is, it is not under civil service. If there is any place on earth where we should require technical and experienced knowledge it is in that set-up. I hope when the Celler bill is passed that this House will realize that situation and remedy

the mistake which it has already made in the set-up as it is down there now, where you appoint someone in a technical position simply because he has sufficient backing to get the appointment, and the appointment has no permanency. I am willing for them all to be Democrats, if they are qualified.

Mr. WOODRUM. I am glad the gentleman suggested that, and I wish to say to the gentleman from Michigan and to the House and to the country that the President has appointed as Archivist Mr. R. D. W. Connor, who for 12 years was a member of the faculty of the University of North Carolina and for the previous 18 years archivist of the State of North Carolina, a distinguished, outstanding gentleman. I know him, and I can assure the gentleman from Michigan that merit, capacity, and capability will be the guiding rules in the selection of the personnel for the archives.

Mr. MICHENER. But right there I believe that to be true, and for that reason he should be under civil service so that men of that character would not be in danger of being removed the moment the administration changed.

Mr. WOODRUM. In answer to that, I will say to the gentleman, that the gentleman knows the Congressional Library is not under civil service, yet it has never been subject to political spoils, and I anticipate the same thing will apply to the National Archives.

Mr. MICHENER. But we can make it sure and know.

Mr. WOODRUM. Perhaps we can.

Mr. HEALEY. Will the gentleman yield briefly?

Mr. WOODRUM. I yield.

Mr. HEALEY. In that connection does not the gentleman feel that the Archivist will have more latitude to select the type of personnel which the gentleman has just mentioned?

Mr. WOODRUM. At an appropriate time I could have quite an interesting discussion with my friend from Michigan as to whether, after all, you do get more efficient people by going to the Civil Service, especially in this type of personnel.

Mr. MICHENER. For certain kinds of work.

Mr. WOODRUM. For almost any kind of work.

Mr. MICHENER. So far as book knowledge is concerned, yes; and that is the archivists.

Mr. WOODRUM. The bill of the gentleman from New York has yet to be enacted into law. It is, so to speak, resting in the discretion of the House. There are no appropriations in this deficiency bill for it. When the Celler bill is taken up for discussion the House can put such provisions in it as it pleases.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUM. I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, and to make brief quotations from these documents from which I have read relative to the promotion and progress of this movement for a National Archives. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KELLER].

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Chairman, I want to take just about 2 minutes of the time of the House, no more, to call attention to the fact that if you will read the bill, H. R. 5703, the Keller bill, you will find no necessity for imagination there at all. You will find, I think, no indefiniteness at all; the number of books, pamphlets, and all of the publications of the Government Printing Office are set out in the bill. We are asking for two where it is not otherwise specified, and no more. There is an exception made in the Official Register of the United States; we want six copies of that, and we want one extra copy of the daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as we run along, just for use down there; not bound. You will find they want one copy of every bill and resolution of Congress at each stage of its consideration for the purpose of having a full and complete history of how and when changes are made in the formative stages of legislation. It is a very informative process to a man doing research.

I have had experience in this regard myself and often have wandered blindly, and without aid insofar as tracing

the various stages and changes made in the past when legislation was under consideration, in order to know what to do in a current situation. There should be some one place where we could follow the changes step by step. We ask for only one of each document here as it comes from the printing press that it may be kept as part of the great repository of the history of the country.

To illustrate, the legislation in relation to creation of our legal-tender notes, or greenbacks, during the Civil War period, is almost entirely shrouded in mystery for lack of any specific records or debates on that subject, despite the fact that this legislation is among the most important in American history. Much more can be learned from outside sources than from the Government records. The fact that the original \$60,000,000 of greenbacks, not containing the exception clause, which later issues contained, maintained its parity with gold throughout its existence is hardly known to the students of that subject for lack of Government records. I made this statement on the floor of this House in the Seventy-second Congress only to be challenged by one of the ablest men and best students of this body, my friend, Dr. Oliver, of Alabama. And only after digging out the historic facts on that subject could I convince him, or this House, of this all-important fact. The document rooms of the Capitol keep the bills only for a current Congress. The general impression is that these bills and resolutions are available in the Library of Congress, but even there there is a gap of about 50 years where these things are not available. Surely this condition should not be permitted to continue. And the National Archives must be the Nation's absolutely safe repository for these invaluable historic documents.

I want to state that so far as I am concerned I am in hearty accord with the proposition that Congress should pass on the necessity of every one of these things. But this authorization must be continuous and permanent, or we will find a period of a week, or perhaps longer even when books, pamphlets, and copies of other documents which should go to this Archives Establishment will not arrive there. We want to avoid the possibility.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of the time.

I may state, Mr. Chairman, that the amount of the appropriation for the Archives Establishment is the result of a very searching investigation on the part of the deficiency subcommittee which consisted of 10 members of the Appropriations Committee. The estimate was \$550,000. We reduced this \$75,000. We figure this amount is ample for the starting of this activity. Should need for increased funds arise through additional work and they can demonstrate to Congress the necessity of this work to preserve the history of our country and instill those lessons into our posterity, we can pass on giving them the increased amount when the demonstrated necessity arises.

As to whether or not \$475,000 is too much or too little, no man can tell at this stage of the game when it is actually a new set-up all around. I have this confidence, however, the Archivist, Dr. Connor, is a very intelligent, a very patriotic man, and one sincerely interested not only in the preservation of the history of our country but in cutting down appropriations as much as possible; and I do not believe he will unnecessarily put on employees and expand his organization unless there is actual necessity for it. I think, therefore, the \$475,000 should be allowed.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that the Clerk read the bill for amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

For payment to the widow of Frederick Landis, late a Representative-elect from the State of Indiana, \$9,500.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BUCHANAN: On page 2, strike out lines 11 and 12.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, it was with great hesitation that I offered this amendment. The proposition was subject to a point of order; but I did not desire to make the point of order, because I felt it was a question that concerns personally every Member of this House, and they ought to have a right to pass on it. Secondly, I did not make the point of order because of the two preceding allowances, which are along the same lines but are clearly within the established precedents.

Mr. Chairman, this provision which my amendment eliminates, if adopted, will allow a year's salary to Mr. Landis' widow. It will enlarge the scope of the precedents beyond anything ever done heretofore, including other cases where we have refused to make the appropriations. I am going to state the facts in this case.

In connection with every allowance heretofore made the Member has been on the salary roll or a sitting Member of the House. He has been a qualified Member under the law as it then stood. Sometimes they have not actually taken the oath of office, but their term of office had commenced. They were drawing the salary and discharging their duty in every case heretofore allowed.

In this case, the gentleman was elected on November 6, and, unfortunately, he died on November 15. At the time he died there was a sitting Member of this House representing the same district duly qualified and drawing a salary. If both of them had died at that time you would be called upon to make two appropriations for two Members from one district. You understand that when this man died, having just been elected, his predecessor still held the office, and if the predecessor had died, his wife or dependents would have been entitled to an appropriation. Mr. Landis did not have a certificate of election. I may state that he died on November 15, and the certificates of election from the State of Indiana were not issued by the State authorities until December 1.

Mr. Chairman, those are the facts. If the Members want to enlarge the precedents and include within the scope of the precedents all Members who may or may not have been elected and who die just after election, that is your business. It is not mine. If the Members want to include those individuals who have not received their certificates of election, it is your business, not mine. When this House speaks, as Chairman of the Appropriations Committee I am expected to obey the will of the House, but I am determined that the Appropriations Committee while I am its chairman shall not itself enlarge on these precedents. Personally, I am opposed to this class of appropriations, whether within the precedents or not.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, first of all, may I say that I greatly appreciate the very fine attitude of the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BUCHANAN]. I want to thank him and the committee for giving me the opportunity of appearing before a Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee in order to present this matter in the first instance. I appreciate intensely the action that the chairman has taken in not making a point of order in respect to this particular item.

The Honorable Frederick Landis was elected to this Congress from the second district of the State of Indiana on last November 6. Frederick Landis had been a Member of Congress from the State of Indiana. He had served in the Fifty-eighth and Fifty-ninth Congresses. He had served with credit and honor to himself, to his State, and to the Nation. Possibly it does not have much to do with this particular item; but while he was here his brother, Charles Landis, was also a Member of the Congress from the State of Indiana.

Fred Landis in his lifetime gave much of his time and effort to those things which were of general interest to

the people of the land, and participated in all those activities which were for the encouragement, the enlightenment, and the education of the people of the whole land. But by the same token his activities and his business life were such that he did not accumulate that sort of an estate which many men of his ability are able to accumulate. He went through a strenuous campaign in the primary, then went into the fall campaign and before the election he was taken ill with pneumonia and died a few days after election.

If the Members of the House see fit to allow the item as asked for in this bill presented by the committee, it will not be subject to the criticism that is sometimes made as to these gratuities; that is, that the people to whom they are granted do not need the money.

I say to you that these people need the money. Fred Landis put in his effort and his time and sacrificed his life, if you please, to be elected to this Congress. I for one cannot see very much distinction between the case of a man who is elected and who has not been sworn in and dies before the term begins and a man who is elected, whose term has begun but who is not in reality a Member of Congress because he has not been sworn in. Such a distinction would be a distinction without a difference. In other words, there are precedents heretofore existing under which the dependents of individuals who have been elected were granted the gratuity when the person who was elected died before being sworn in or having taken the oath of office.

Fred Landis has left a family of six children and a widow. May I say that the people of Indiana, without regard to politics, loved Fred Landis. They love his widow and his children. A number of those children are minors, and, Mr. Chairman, I cannot believe that there is a dangerous precedent to be set here by anything that might be done today which will react unfavorably against future Congresses or so extend its precedents as to prejudice seriously the Treasury of the United States.

Why, I believe this is a wonderful custom that has grown up. It is not only afforded to the families of deceased Congressmen. It is extended to the families of those people who are employed in this building and of our people in the Foreign Service.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, certainly no serious detriment or dangerous precedent can arise out of the allowance of this item. The time now is short between the date of election and the date that Congressmen take office. There cannot in the future be any considerable number of deaths in that time.

I am saying to you today that if, in your kindness, as a further expression of the generosity with which this Government of ours has treated all of its people in recent years and throughout all of its history, you grant this appropriation, I am confident your action will meet with the approval not only of the people of the State of Indiana but of the country as a whole. I ask you to allow this item to stay in this bill. [Applause.]

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, knowing the facts and circumstances connected with this matter, I feel it my duty to support my colleague, Representative CHARLES A. HALLECK, who is the author of the legislation to pay to the widow of Mr. Fred Landis the equivalent of 1 year's salary of a Member of Congress. In doing so, I wish in a preliminary way to say that no one in this Congress has a higher appreciation than I have of the sound judgment and devotion to duty of the able Chairman of the Appropriations Committee [Mr. BUCHANAN]. I think that in ninety-nine cases out of one hundred I follow his leadership. He gives the most intensive

study and application to problems of government with a view always to protecting the interests of those who have to pay the taxes and bear the burdens. He is so modest and self-effacing that few persons know the far-reaching extent of his activities in the public interest; but I know, because I serve on his committee under him, and I want to say in his presence that he is a distinct and valuable asset to the American Nation.

He is one of the most useful Members of Congress I have known in my long career as a newspaper correspondent and as a Member of this legislative body. Also I want to say that I share his concern that these gratuity appropriations shall be held within proper bounds. In that matter he is dead right. By their very nature they need to be carefully safeguarded.

Now let me state the circumstances of this particular case. Nine days after Frederick Landis was elected as Representative in Congress from the Second Indiana District, he died. As far as the earning of this death gratuity is concerned, that is a closed incident. It was earned just as much as my death gratuity was earned, just as much as yours was earned, just as much as the potential death gratuity of any Member of this House was earned. [Applause.] The only difference is that we were fortunate and lived and Fred Landis was unfortunate and died in the brief interim after he was elected and before he was sworn in. It was earned by Fred Landis himself in a hard and grueling campaign in which he spent all he had of physical energy and financial substance, a campaign in which he conducted himself as a gentleman and an honorable warrior, as he always did in every relation of life. In a campaign in which there was no taint of accusation of fraud, he won by a decisive majority of more than 10,000 votes.

To those who remember Fred Landis when he was a Member of Congress several terms many years ago, I need not describe his fine qualities. His political beliefs were utterly at variance with my Democratic philosophy, but like everyone else who knew him, I loved him. He was the kind of man who when he saw a mendicant shivering on a street corner would hand over his overcoat and after that Fred Landis would do the shivering. He was not acquisitive in any sense. A man like that is too generous to amass a fortune. He died leaving a widow and six children, and this allowance would be a veritable godsend to them.

Anyone who studies all the facts connected with this case must conclude that if we say "no" to Mrs. Landis and her children, they will be beaten out of an allowance which her husband earned, and they will be beaten out of it by the merest technicality. Year after year we pay to widows of very rich Members this death gratuity, even though they may be rolling in affluence, and as long as that rule stands I cannot bring myself to deny this worthy necessitous woman and her family of six because of a technicality. I think I hew to the line of economy as closely as anyone in this Chamber. I have voted against most of the large appropriations, and I expect to continue to vote against many, but when we are spending money in great amounts for shelter belts, to buy submarginal land and plug up soil erosion, and similar projects, I think we would do well to inject this tiny bit of humanity into our appropriations. I trust that no Member on the Republican side will object to this appropriation, and I trust that our Democratic Members will show true sportsmanship and grant this allowance to the widow and children of a foeman who was worthy of our steel. [Applause.]

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUDLOW. I yield to my friend, the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KNUTSON. I do not recall a similar case in the 19 years I have been a Member of this House. So I do not think we would be setting a dangerous precedent by allowing this gratuity, and it is my information that Mrs. Landis needs this money and needs it badly, and I hope the good Chairman of the Appropriations Committee, for whom I have the highest regard, will not oppose this item.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I may say to the gentleman that I have offered a motion to strike it out of the bill and I am going to vote for the motion because I do not think it ought to be allowed.

Mr. LUDLOW. If I may comment on the statement made by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Knutson] we now have the "lame duck" amendment which bridges very closely the time between a Member's election and the time he takes the oath of office and this reduces very greatly the possibility that this action may become an embarrassing precedent. I venture to say that in 50 years there would not be a couple of cases analogous to this one.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph close in 10 minutes.

Mr. EKWALL. Mr. Chairman, I object to that.

Mr. TABER. I hope the gentleman from Oregon will not object.

Mr. EKWALL. Very well; I withdraw the objection, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I want to join with the distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] and my friend from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW] in urging upon my colleagues the retention of this item in this bill.

I was profoundly impressed by the argument made by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], supplemented by the always able and profound argument of my friend from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW].

I was also deeply impressed by the position taken by the chairman of the committee, Mr. BUCHANAN. I do not think, if we keep this item in the bill, that the chairman of the committee is going to let one tear drop from his eyes. From the very expression of his face and his actions we can read his mind and see that his position is purely technical, and that if we vote to keep the item in the bill, there will be no disturbed feeling so far as he is concerned.

I think a clear case is made out. I did not know the late Representative-elect, I do not know any member of his family, but I do know there is only a slight technicality between this case entitling the widow and children to this sum and the case of the death of an actual Member.

There is only a thin line of demarcation between this case and the case of a widow of a deceased Member. I think it is a very fine thing on the part of the Subcommittee on Appropriations to place the item in this bill, and I think it was an equally fine thing on the part of the chairman not to raise a point of order in order that the House might pass upon this question. I think we can well draw the inference that, because the chairman permitted it to remain in the bill without raising the point of order, that he is not really opposed to it, that he is not opposed to what everyone would like to see so far as this item is concerned, and that the chairman will be in complete agreement with our action in keeping it in the bill. A case has been clearly made out. Only a technicality exists relating to the time of the untimely death of the Representative-elect from the standpoint of equity. I shall vote to keep this item in the bill. [Applause.]

Mr. WOODRUM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes.

Mr. WOODRUM. After all, is it not a distinction without a difference? A man is elected to Congress, and when he is elected actually begins the work of a Congressman.

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes.

Mr. WOODRUM. He is given the franking privilege and, if available, office space is given to him. His constituents treat him as a Congressman and he is recognized in the departments and bureaus as a Congressman. Is it not a distinction without a difference to say if he dies one day his family will be given this consideration, but if he dies another day the same will not be received?

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman's contribution is not only correct and constructive but convincing.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Chairman, this is a question of precedent, as I understand it, and precedent only. Right and wrong, justice and other things are not involved from the standpoint of the opposition. Our chairman, I am confident, is as sympathetic as any of the rest of us, but he considers it his duty as chairman of this committee merely to bring up the question of precedent. This is not a legal question. There is a very great distinction, in my opinion, between a legal precedent and an usage precedent. If it were a legal precedent, I do not believe that I could stand here and speak on this subject; but as a usage precedent, it is a very different matter. By a usage precedent, I mean that some other Congress, with no more authority, with no more right, has chosen to make a decision possibly different from what we have now before us. There are no two cases in which the facts are exactly the same. There are no two sets of conditions exactly the same. I say a precedent of that sort should not be considered in the same position as a legal precedent.

Let us see what would qualify, according to former actions of the House, to put a man in the class where his family could receive this gratuity. One thing is that his election had gone to the point where he had actually sat in the House one day. What difference does it make in the eyes of justice whether the man was here one day or died shortly before he had opportunity of being here? That case would plainly have come in under the precedents heretofore set, and we would have had no hesitancy in giving the gratuity to his widow. But we should remember this: That as far as being in Congress is concerned this man started and made his race, just as you and I did, during the 6 months before the election. This man spent his money and his time. He had a right, in thinking of the good of his own family, to consider that the money would come back to him should he be elected, and he was elected; and, as the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] suggested, he was elected in every particular except the mere form of having that fact certified. He had the franking privilege; he had the right to an office here; he had a right to the emoluments that any other man who was elected to Congress had at that time.

Mr. MILLARD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'NEAL. Yes.

Mr. MILLARD. And, furthermore, he also served two terms in the Fifty-eighth and Fifty-ninth Congresses. He was a former Member of Congress.

Mr. O'NEAL. I was going to say that another affirmative precedent would have brought him within the rule had he served in the Seventy-third Congress. Then our former precedents would have included his case. What difference does it make whether he served in the Seventy-third or the Seventieth? He was a former Member of this House. From the standpoint of reason, justice demands that we take the same action in this case. [Applause.] But where there is no legal precedent and where there is no exactly analogous case, the fact that this man made a successful race, and except for the hand of fate would have been with us today, I say that no arbitrary rule of this sort should keep the widow and six children from having that to which they are fairly entitled. Of the six children, one, the oldest, who would help to provide for the family, is in a sanitarium. Of the other five, at least four are under age. I certainly hope this amendment, offered here as a matter of duty by our honorable chairman, will be voted down and the bill allowed to pass as it now stands. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

Crop production loans: To enable the Governor of the Farm Credit Administration to carry into effect the provisions of the act entitled "An act to provide for loans to farmers for crop production and harvesting during the year 1935, and for other purposes", approved February 20, 1935, including personal services and rent in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; paper, printing, and binding; supplies and services, without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 41, sec. 5), when the

aggregate amount involved does not exceed \$50; and such other expenses as may be necessary; there is hereby reappropriated and made immediately available and to remain available until June 30, 1936, for the foregoing purposes, a total of \$60,000,000 from unobligated balances (to be designated by the President) under allocations from the appropriation of \$525,000,000 for relief in stricken agricultural areas contained in the Emergency Appropriation Act, fiscal year 1935.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BURDICK: Page 4, line 15, after the word "of", strike out "\$60,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$100,000,000."

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment that it is not authorized by law.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, I am convinced that not only the authorization which this Congress has already passed for the expenditure of \$60,000,000 will have to be reversed, but the appropriation itself if we let it stand will also have to be reversed. I have abundant proof that we made a mistake when we authorized only \$60,000,000, because that is not enough; and it appears to me that while a point of order may be successfully raised on this amendment, we will be saving time by not raising the point of order and make the appropriation \$100,000,000, and, if necessary, pass other legislation authorizing further expenditure.

The CHAIRMAN. As the Chair understands, this appropriation is limited to \$60,000,000.

Mr. BUCHANAN. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LEMKE: On page 4, line 19, after the figures "1935", add the following: "Such loans to farmers for crop production and harvesting to be made with expedition, and without the usual red tape and delay, and without unreasonable restrictions and requirements, under unnecessary technical rules and regulations, in order to carry out the intent of Congress to provide seed and feed, in seasonable time, for the unfortunate farmers in the drought-stricken areas."

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the amendment is legislation, not proper on an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. LEMKE] desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Chairman, I may state that the purpose of this amendment is not new legislation but that it is simply directory. We feel that if the farmers are entitled to this money at all, they should have it before seeding time and not by harvest time. It simply suggests and directs how the appropriation shall be made and used. For instance, if we had said that the \$60,000,000 should be paid in two installments, \$30,000,000 at one time and \$30,000,000 at another, that would not be new legislation. This is simply directory, suggesting to those in charge of this \$60,000,000 how and under what circumstances and when it shall be loaned.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that this is a limitation. It seems to me that it retrenches. Of course, I have not read the amendment, and the language is a little indefinite, but it refers to red tape. I do not know just what the legal definition of red tape would be.

Mr. LEMKE. The gentleman should know by this time that rules, regulations, and red tape is all that we find in the various departments of the Government.

Mr. MICHENER. But it at least contemplates there is something being done that should not be done, which costs money. Therefore if the red tape is eliminated, the expense will be eliminated. Therefore it is limiting and retrenching, and it makes the amendment in order. If it does that, if it limits and reduces the expense, then it is in order.

Mr. BACON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield.

Mr. BACON. Does not the gentleman think that the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. LEMKE] is an optimist when he proposes to eliminate red tape from the Department of Agriculture?

Mr. MICHENER. Yes; I think that is true. We should eliminate it, however.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. COLE of Maryland). The Chair is ready to rule. The gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. LEMKE] states to the Chair that the amendment is directory. That in itself is an admission that it is legislation. Therefore the Chair sustains the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

Pensions: For an additional amount for the payment of pensions, gratuities, and allowances, including the same objects specified under this head in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1935, \$94,650,000.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 6, after line 6, insert: "to enable the Department of Agriculture to cooperate with State game and fish departments in the extermination of crows, blackbirds, and starlings endangering crops by destroying seed grain, \$50,000."

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. COLE of Maryland). The Chair sustains the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

United States penitentiary, Leavenworth, Kans., buildings: For construction and repair of buildings, including the purchase and installation of machinery and equipment and all expenses incident thereto, to be expended so as to give the maximum amount of employment to inmates of the institution, \$65,410, to remain available until June 30, 1936.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I think is acceptable to the committee.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. OLIVER: Page 9, line 15, after the figures "1936", insert: " : Provided, That the use of the annex by the Bureau of Prisons, Department of Justice, is hereby continued until otherwise provided by law."

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, we accept the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. COLE of Maryland, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 6644) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1935, and prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1935, and for other purposes, directed him to report the same back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the amendment and the bill to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Ways and Means Committee may have until midnight tonight to file a report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

KEEPING FAITH WITH THE WORLD WAR VETERANS

Mr. McFARLANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McFARLANE. Mr. Speaker, on March 4 and 5 the Ways and Means Committee held hearings on H. R. 1 and H. R. 3896 and the seven other similar bills dealing with the payment of the balance due on the adjusted-service certificates.

The hearings were thorough and covered all phases of the subject matter. Congressman PATMAN and friends of his measure presented their arguments the first day and Congressman VINSON and the four representatives of the American Legion presented their bill the second day. Seven Members of Congress, besides the author, together with 11 others, including representatives of other veterans' organizations and economists, appeared in behalf of H. R. 1. Mr. VINSON and the four representatives of the American Legion appeared in behalf of H. R. 3896.

WHAT THE HEARINGS DEVELOPED

The testimony of the representatives of the Legion clearly showed that they were strongly opposed to the Patman bill. They termed it inflationary. Their measure (H. R. 3896) authorizing an appropriation to be made later would require a bond issue or new taxes for payment. The Patman bill provides payment with new currency, with little, if any, additional expense to the Government. Printing of currency costs about 30 cents per \$1,000.

WHY THE ANIMUS OF THE LEGION LEADERS?

To understand the personal enmity of the Legion oligarchy toward the Patman bill it is necessary to go back and view the background of the issues here raised and to review the politics of the Legion to understand whether or not their position is sincere at this time.

HISTORY OF ADJUSTED-SERVICE CERTIFICATE LEGISLATION

The records show that the World War veteran never asked for the adjusted-service certificates; it was Congress who recognized the justness of the obligation and originated the legislation back soon after the war. Did the representatives of the American Legion before Congress fight for the same rights for the soldier as was given to all other parties connected with the war? No; the records show that the representatives of the Legion, including the present directing legislative head, John Thomas Taylor, stood by and let the World War veteran take a licking in the form of this "tombstone" bonus payable in 1945 instead of payment in cash in 1919 and 1920 as was paid to the railroads, war contractors, and all others but the soldiers who were connected with the war. So this certificate was not what the soldier wanted or had asked for, but what a rock-ribbed reactionary Republican standpat Congress said they could have.

The soldiers' friends in Congress, recognizing that they had been given a raw deal, have tried ever since the enacting of this I O U law to do the right thing and pay off this indebtedness in cash, as was done all others soon after the close of the war.

PATMAN'S RECORD ON DIFFERENT MEASURES

Congressman PATMAN offered his first bill for payment of this indebtedness on May 28, 1929—H. R. 3493. This measure called for payment by sale of bonds. His second bill was offered on December 8, 1931—H. R. 1. This bill was an authorization bill, the same as H. R. 3896, now supported by the American Legion. On January 14, 1932, Mr. PATMAN

offered his third measure, H. R. 7726, which provided payment with Treasury notes in the sum of \$1, \$2, \$5, \$10, \$20, and so forth. This measure was later amended by former Senator Owens' plan, which provided payment by requiring bonds bearing 3½ percent, to be placed in the Federal Reserve banks, to be sold if necessary to stabilize the commodity price level. The next bill was introduced March 9, 1933, providing payment through issuance of currency and stabilization through withdrawal of bank currency backed by Government securities, if necessary, to stabilize prices. This present measure—H. R. 1—provides for payment through issuance of new currency, same as the bill of last session, and for withdrawal of currencies by Federal Reserve if necessary to maintain proper price level.

PATMAN SOLD THE COUNTRY ON PAYMENT OF THE CERTIFICATES

Congressman PATMAN, as stated above, submitted almost every kind of bill to the country; and out of this laboratory each successive time has made perfecting amendments to this measure at the suggestion of some of the leading economic authorities of the country; also at the suggestions made by friends of the soldier throughout the country.

WHERE WAS THE LEGION ALL THIS TIME?

Have the legislative leaders of the American Legion been working for the cash payment of this debt during this period of time? The rank and file of their organization have been demanding payment, but the leaders who have attended the national conventions have turned a deaf ear.

In 1932 at Portland, Oreg., the national convention of the American Legion passed its first resolution demanding payment of adjusted-compensation certificates by a vote of 1,167 to 109, as follows:

PAYMENT OF ADJUSTED COMPENSATION

Resolved, That the American Legion endorses and urges the full and immediate payment of the adjusted-service certificates, and that the national officers be instructed immediately to proceed before Congress toward enactment of the legislation * * *.

VETERANS' LEGISLATION

Be it further resolved, That any major changes suggested in veterans' legislation resulting from such investigation shall be referred to the next and succeeding conventions of the American Legion with such recommendations as may be appropriate.

The resolution was adopted.

LEGION LEADERS DISREGARD RESOLUTION DEMANDING CASH SETTLEMENT OF CERTIFICATES

In spite of favorable action on payment of these certificates at the convention, as shown by pages 52 and 53 of the summary of the proceedings published for said convention in the official report of the fourteenth annual national convention, not one word is said in said report about the passage of this resolution or the almost unanimous vote cast upon it. On pages 145 and 146 they do give the vote by States of the 1931 vote had at Detroit defeating cash payment. In other words, the "king makers" wanted to "smother" this matter.

The annual report for 1933 of the American Legion, page 183, by way of trying to explain why they had done nothing about carrying out the mandate of the Portland convention of 1932, had this to say:

ADJUSTED COMPENSATION

Due to the financial situation which has confronted the Federal Government during the past year, no definite and concerted action was taken in either Senate or House of Representatives looking toward passage of a measure to provide immediate cash payment of adjusted-service certificates, as advocated at the Portland convention.

During the short session of the Seventy-second Congress an executive meeting of about 60 Members of the House of Representatives who were friendly to cash payment of the certificates was held on January 16 to consider what course of action they should pursue during the session. After reaffirming their belief in the merits of the cash-payment principle, the group decided to defer House action until a decision had been reached on the question of currency inflation, the House group favoring payment of the certificates through the inflation method. Nothing was accomplished during the short session toward this end.

During the special session of the Seventy-third Congress Senator Arthur Robinson, legionnaire from Indiana, secured a Senate vote on an amendment to the inflation bill (H. R. 3835) which, if adopted, would have provided for the cash payment of the adjusted-service certificates. Senator Robinson's amendment was

defeated in the Senate, 28 to 60, on April 28, 1933. * * * Following this Senate defeat of the proposal to cash the certificates, no further efforts were made toward this end during the special session.

PATMAN KEEPS ON FIGHTING

Congressman PATMAN offered his third bill, H. R. 7726, on January 14, 1932, and the Owens amendment, December term, 1932, and even though the American Legion had gone on record at their national convention favoring full cash payment, not one member of their national legislative committee appeared before the Ways and Means Committee on behalf of this legislation. Mr. John Thomas Taylor was the paid legislative counsel for the Legion at that time and has been down to date.

During the Seventy-third Congress we who favored immediate payment worked hard to secure signers to the petition to bring this measure before Congress and it took us over a year to secure the necessary 145 signers to force a vote on this measure. We had no help from Mr. Taylor or his Legion committee. He was heard to congratulate certain Members of Congress for voting against the bonus last session when we finally did secure a vote on same. This is the way these convention leaders of the Legion have kept faith with the rank and file. They seem to be more worried about inflation than they are following clear instructions from the rank and file who elected them and who are paying their salaries and expenses.

KING MAKERS PLAY POLITICS

The "king makers" of the Legion make all national conventions and make the slate for the selection of all national officers and bring about the results they want on all business transacted at these conventions as much as possible.

National Commander Belgrano and John Thomas Taylor and through little cliques would have the committee and this Congress believe in their "altruistic motives" in coming here at this late hour favoring a bill they had introduced (3896) January 14, 1935, to pay the balance due on these certificates. Let us look at the background again.

The same group, very largely, who controlled the Legion in 1932 have controlled it since then. That convention, by a vote of 1,167 to 109, favored the cash-payment bonus, and it was a continuing resolution. PATMAN was there with other Members of Congress fighting for it; the hearings in 1932 covered 841 pages; the fight was hot; where were the Legion leaders? In 1933 at Chicago they did not permit a resolution favoring the bonus, but they did take time to pass resolutions favoring "Studying taxation", Hearst's "Buy American plan", favoring cooperation with the N. R. A., recommending "the elimination of injustices brought about by the exemption of tax-exempt securities", and also a resolution demanding a "sound dollar", as follows:

Be it resolved by the American Legion in national convention assembled, That we favor a careful study by our Government of the dangers of inflation and that we favor a sound American dollar.

SOUND-DOLLAR DEBATE AT CHICAGO CONVENTION

When the sound-dollar resolution came before the 1933 convention at Chicago, Mr. Barron, of Minnesota, objected to its consideration, as follows:

Mr. BARRON (Minnesota). Mr. Commander, members of the resolutions committee, and comrades, I think we have here a fitting example of the type of legislation that the Legion should shun. [Applause.]

I have during the course of 14 years of Legion service in my department realized the trend, and at times the almost constant trend, toward taking the Legion into the controversial field that is not truly germane to Legion purposes. Sometimes there are those resolutions which we may class as border-line resolutions, where there might be some question as to whether or not they are matters which truly and intimately concern us as an organization, but I have no hesitancy, comrades of this convention, in saying to you that from the bottom of my heart I feel that this resolution has no place on the Legion program.

I am advised that the resolution in its original form received very spirited debate before the committee. I understand that it was bitterly opposed, and that the present resolution is, in effect, a compromise. I think that the time has come when, if we are to concentrate upon the things for which the Legion stands, a rehabilitation program which is preeminent, we have got to hew to the line, and we can't permit ourselves to be drawn into controversies such as this. I therefore move you that this resolution be laid upon the table. [Applause.]

Then the "ringleaders" took charge, and the following debate was had on the adoption of the sound-dollar resolution:

Mr. VINCENT CARROLL (Pennsylvania). I rise to a point of order, Mr. Commander. I consider that the previous speaker was speaking on a motion, and I desire to present the other side of the question to this convention. If the speaker who preceded me insists on his motion to table, I will ask you, Mr. Commander, to make a ruling on it.

Mr. BARRON. I think the gentleman is correct, and I willingly withdraw my motion to allow for discussion.

National Commander JOHNSON. Both sides will be heard on all matters in this convention. The Chair would not have suffered that to go by, even if it had not been challenged.

Mr. CARROLL. I will yield to Past Commander Stevens if he desires to take the floor.

National Commander JOHNSON. Past National Commander Henry Stevens. [Applause.]

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. Chairman, my comrades of this convention, I had the happy privilege this year of serving as a member of the resolutions committee. I now have the honor of defending the conclusions of that committee before this honorable body. May I say to you at the outset that this resolution certainly had full consideration, that its every angle was fully discussed, and finally the committee decided to strike out the "whereas" of the original resolution, and this resolution, as you heard it read, was practically the unanimous opinion of your resolutions committee, composed of one man from each department in the entire Legion.

You all know me, and I certainly came from way back down yonder in the country recesses of North Carolina, an agricultural State, and when farm products don't bring anything for farmers, when agricultural conditions suffer, country lawyers have a hell of a time in North Carolina.

My friends, to my mind this is one of the big questions confronting this convention. We have here facing us an inflationary program sponsored by people yonder in Wall Street who desire to recoup their losses sustained in 1929 by manipulation of the stock market. They are for inflation, they are not for secure American currency.

And then you have heard it noised about, as I have heard it noised about, it bears an insidious influence in propaganda emanating from certain foreign governments that seek to drive the American dollar down perhaps to 10 or 25 cents, pay their war debts to us in a dollar that has no valuation whatsoever.

Back yonder, when you were in the trenches, when you were in the training camps, you sent home or you paid into the Government each month such and such a sum for an insurance policy that was to safeguard your loved ones waiting for you back at home. You paid good American dollars for that protection for your people, and if inflation became the vogue, if the dollar was run down to where it had no value and wall-paper money became the currency of our day, that \$10,000 policy that you paid good, hard-earned money for would buy about \$4,000 worth of stuff for your wife and your children.

Before the resolutions committee the other day we had a lot of flowery talk, but there was one fellow that spoke on this question that impressed me more than anything I have heard on it.

Our disabled men have already been cut, he said, and for God's sake don't let inflation come about and drive down the value of what little pension we have left.

My friends, I have got to talk fast, but bear this in mind, with the compensation of veterans cut, with the sole revenue for rehabilitation service and the child welfare service coming from the \$5,000,000 endowment fund given to us by the people, if you pass an inflationary measure, drive down those bonds to 50 percent of their present value, you cut off your source of revenue to protect and defend these poor, disabled buddies of yours who are looking to your rehabilitation service for that protection.

I plead with you to sustain this resolution, and let's have "guts" enough to lead the fight. [Applause.]

National Commander JOHNSON. Any further discussion? Are you ready for the question?

I recognize Vincent Carroll. I recognize, and the convention will recognize, too, the right of the chairman of the convention committee to speak last.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Commander and comrades of the convention, the only reason I take a few minutes of your valuable time in these waning hours of this great convention is because the gentleman from Minnesota, who addressed himself to this situation, started out by saying that the American Legion should shun this. He said further, comrades of this convention, that the American Legion should not engage in any controversial matter. I am here, members of this convention, because I believe the American Legion should, irrespective of whether this is a matter of controversy, national or local, give expression on this subject. Its members, you men and women, represent every cross section of our citizenry, and I believe that a pronouncement on this matter at this time would surely result in a proper final determination of the matter; for disturbing and uncertain as the situation now is (there is, as we know, an adverse effect on business, on industry, and on finance), we heard, members of this convention, our President make a statement within the bounds of this city on Monday morning, and I believe from the statement there made by the President of the United States, our Commander in Chief, that there is a determination in his heart—and I gather it from his own expression—and in his mind as well, to keep the faith of his party with

the American people he now leads. I believe he has a determination with his own conscience—and this comes from a Republican from Pennsylvania—to keep the pledge to the American people of sound money; and, members of this convention, you should give expression on that, if for no other reason than that you received a bid from him.

Ninety dollars a month is the exact amount of compensation that the disabled man received. What would he receive in the shape of \$90 per month, I ask you, were we to follow this specious theory of deflation of the American dollar? What would happen to that \$90 a month, I ask you men and women legionnaires? Is it not our first obligation, and must we not express ourselves on these controversial matters where we have the interests of the disabled veteran as the first obligation of this organization? I cannot help but think that if we were to follow this specious theory of an unsound dollar we would not be holding up the hands of the Executive of this country who has made a bid for our expression. We would be turning against the man that gets \$90 a month, the widow, the orphan, and the disabled man who gets an amount less than that. We would be devaluating that which has been given to him and her and those children, devaluating that; and we know there is not a chance to get that amount increased, no matter what the value of the dollar may be taken to.

Have we not a right to express ourselves on this? Have we not a right, I say, when the effort is being made by foreign governments to make us devalue our dollar so that those debts may be paid off with paper of an amount greatly less than the amount that was advanced at the time those debts were created. [Time was called.]

Mr. KNOWLES (Florida). I move to table the resolution under discussion.

National Commander JOHNSON. The Chair will not close the debate without giving the chairman of this committee the opportunity to speak, and he does not recognize Mr. Knowles, of Florida, until the chairman has spoken. I shall be glad to recognize you then. I announced a while ago the chairman of this committee would be protected and given the right to say the final word.

Mr. JOSEPH EDGAR (New Jersey). After all, this convention is merely a larger committee on resolutions, and there is no reason why you shouldn't react in the same manner as we reacted yesterday after listening to several hours of discussion.

My purpose here on this particular resolution is to give you a history, a short history, of what took place in the resolutions committee. We had all types of feeling on the matter. First we had the side as represented by Henry Stevens, to keep the money sound. Then we had the side as represented by Howell, of Louisiana, who said that the President had the right, under existing legislation, to inflate to a limit of 50 percent. Then we had the man from the Middle West, who said he was a small merchant, and told of the advantages possible of inflation, and could see no harm in inflation. Then we had the man who came from Kansas, who was a member of the American Federation of Labor. He said he thought if you had inflation it might hurt the laboring people. Then we had a banker from Utah, and he said nobody knows what it is all about.

The resolution that was argued in our committee for some 3 or 4 hours was about a page long. All at once everybody saw the light at our committee, and, lo and behold, we arrived at a resolution which, unfortunately, some of you think is for inflation, and I am afraid a lot of you think it is against inflation, but I think, if you will listen to it again, you will be satisfied, as the committee was, in the final result, and here it is:

"Be it resolved by the American Legion in national convention assembled, That we favor a careful study by our Government on the dangers of inflation, and we favor a sound American dollar."

I don't know how much the dollar will be, but a sound American dollar. In view of this explanation and what the committee arrived at, I would appreciate very much calling for the question on the adoption of the resolution. [Applause.]

There were calls for the question.

National Commander JOHNSON. I promised the gentleman from Florida that he would be given an opportunity, if he wanted to make, to make the motion to lay on the table, which seems, from the applause of the convention, would but serve to delay the convention. Do you still want to make it?

Mr. KNOWLES (Florida). I do not.

National Commander JOHNSON. The question is on the motion, which is the adoption of the resolution. All in favor will signify by saying "aye"; opposed "no." The Chair rules that the motion is adopted.

SWORN TESTIMONY BEFORE UN-AMERICAN COMMITTEE

Then we turn to the sworn testimony before the Special House Committee Investigating Un-American Activities, and what do we find?

Mr. CHRISTMAS. I think I began to discuss inflation with him (MacGuire) early in 1933. We had many discussions about it. He thought he could spare some time to do some traveling, so my thought was it would be a good idea for him to discuss this question with prominent people in various parts of the country. When I say "prominent", I mean substantial citizens in different localities; and see if we could work up any sentiment for sound currency and against inflation. If I may put it this way, there were three ways this matter could have been handled. Mr. MacGuire could have sat in his office and written letters and made telephone calls and spent very little money and would have gotten nowhere. I

told him when he traveled that I expected him to travel in a way which would enable him to meet these substantial people and that he was to entertain lavishly. As I say, I think his travels began sometime in June, at which time I understand he was using his own funds, for which he was entitled to reimbursement from these funds at a later date. As I recall it, he made two or three trans-continental trips * * *

The CHAIRMAN. Was he at the American Legion convention there?

Mr. CHRISTMAS. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Were you there?

Mr. CHRISTMAS. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. When did the period of this entertainment end?

Mr. CHRISTMAS. The period ended, I should say, about the latter part of December 1933 * * *

The CHAIRMAN. So the way you want to leave it is there is \$65,000 or \$66,000 that Mr. MacGuire received from either you or Mr. Clark, which he spent in the period between June and December of 1933 for traveling and entertainment expenses. * * *

And there are other items. Now, has Mr. MacGuire ever given you an accounting as to how he spent that \$65,000 or \$66,000, which is unexplained?

Mr. CHRISTMAS. No. I told him he did not need to account to me for that.

The CHAIRMAN. Who else besides Clark was interested in this sound-dollar propaganda campaign?

Mr. MACGUIRE. Mr. Frew, as I say, contributed money.

The CHAIRMAN. Who else was interested?

Mr. MACGUIRE. And Mr. Doyle was interested.

The CHAIRMAN. And who else?

Mr. MACGUIRE. Mr. Henry Stevens, of Warsaw, N. C.; Tom Bird, of North Carolina; and a number of other prominent legionnaires. I can get the names. They are all a matter of record.

The CHAIRMAN. Whom did the committee consist of?

Mr. MACGUIRE. Mr. Carroll, of Philadelphia.

The CHAIRMAN. What Mr. Carroll?

Mr. MACGUIRE. Vincent Carroll. He is the assistant prosecuting attorney in Philadelphia and a prominent legionnaire. Mr. Henry L. Stevens, Jr.; Mr. Doyle; myself; Mr. Esterbrook; Tom Bird, of North Carolina; Charlie Erskin, of—I think he is in Washington or Oregon—John Quinn; Frank Belgrano, the present national commander.

TRAVELING AND ENTERTAINING

Exhibit B.—Detailed schedule of cash disbursements of the committee for a sound dollar and sound currency December 4, 1933, to May 31, 1934, accounting for \$31,000 expended:

William H. Doyle	\$9,100.00
Henry L. Stevens, Jr.	500.00
Dr. William Dunning, Gonzales, Tex.	400.00
Tom Bird	1,098.50
Vincent Carroll	3,400.00
Charles Esterbrook	2,773.34
George Norton	626.45
Charles Erskine	300.00
Gerald C. MacGuire	1,992.67

The above amounts show partial distribution of the \$31,000 distributed by the Sound Dollar & Currency, Inc., between December 4, 1933, and May 31, 1934, among these legionnaires. Of course, no attempt was made to account for the \$66,000 expended by the sound-dollar committee boys before and during the Chicago Legion convention. Gen. Smedley Butler's sworn testimony before this committee may give us some light how some of this \$66,000 was distributed to the "king makers" who did speak for the sound-dollar resolution:

General BUTLER. The next time I saw him (MacGuire) was about the 1st of September in a hotel in Newark. I went over to the convention of the Twenty-ninth Division. Sunday morning he walked into my room and he asked me if I was getting ready now to take these men out to Chicago, that the convention was pretty close. I said, "No; I am not going to Chicago." "Why not?" I said, "You people are bluffing. You have not got any money." Whereupon he took out a big wallet out of hip pocket and a great big mass of thousand dollar bills and threw them out on the bed. I said, "What's all this?" He says, "This is for you for expenses. You will need some money to pay them."

"How much money have you got there?"

He said, "\$18,000."

"Where did you get those thousand dollar bills?"

"Oh", he said, "last night some contributions were made. I just have not had a chance to deposit them, so I brought them along with me."

The above-quoted testimony was all given under oath before the Special Committee of the House Investigating Un-American Activities. If any of the above-quoted testimony is untrue each and all of these parties so testifying should be prosecuted by the "king makers" of the Legion above mentioned for giving perjured testimony. These hearings have been printed for some time and have had a wide distribution throughout the Nation. We have heard of no

contemplated prosecution by the leaders of the American Legion now advocating "Belgrano's bankers' bonus bill" before Congress.

MONEY TALKS

In other words, it seems from the above-quoted testimony that the "Wall Streeters" had their paid lobbyists—MacGuire, member American Legion distinguished-guest committee—and other prominent legionnaires making transcontinental trips beginning early in 1933, and that they spent \$153,665.86, of which about \$66,000 was spent before and during the Chicago convention (1933) for "traveling and entertaining" and no accounting ever requested.

Now, my friends, do you believe that these leaders of the Legion who have been thus hooked up with the affairs mentioned are coming here opposing H. R. 1 in good faith, when we all know it is the only bill on the subject before Congress which will pay the debt without "creating any additional" debt, in keeping with the Miami resolution, without additional taxes, without any interest, without bonds, without unbalancing the Budget, and will save the overburdened taxpayers over \$1,500,000,000, the amount required, if not paid now, to be set aside by borrowing from the bankers to pay the debt in 1945?

When we know further that if H. R. 3896 passes and becomes a law it will cost the Government over two billion in interest, to say nothing of the interest we will continue to be paying on outstanding bank currency which could and should be retired under the provisions of H. R. 1.

TAX-EXEMPTION RESOLUTION

I wonder why the leaders of the Legion happened to forget the tax-exempt resolution they passed at the Chicago convention following the sound-dollar resolution, as follows:

TAX EXEMPTION

Whereas the issuance of tax-exempt securities by municipalities, counties, States, and the Federal Government has reached an enormous total, thus removing much of our otherwise taxable property from the tax rolls; and

Whereas we of the American Legion are interested in the equitable distribution of the tax burden: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we recommend that an earnest consideration be directed to an elimination of the injustices brought about by issuance of tax-exempt securities. (Italics mine.)

For the first time the Legion leaders come before Congress with their own Legion bill calling for the payment of the balance due on the adjusted-service certificates, H. R. 3896; and they are horrified at the inflation feature of the Patman bill, H. R. 1. Their authorization bill would require payment either through bond issue or through additional taxes, and no one has ever raised his voice favoring the levy of additional taxes for the payment of this measure. Then the Legion leaders come here now advocating the payment of the balance due on the adjusted-service certificates by means of a bond issue, which is contrary to the instructions of the Chicago national convention and contrary to the resolution passed at the Miami convention, calling for the payment as follows:

IMMEDIATE PAYMENT

15. This is what we are all waiting for.

Whereas the immediate cash payment of the adjusted-service certificates will increase tremendously the purchasing power of millions of the consuming public, distributed uniformly throughout the Nation; and will provide relief for the holders thereof who are in dire need and distress because of the present unfortunate economic conditions; and will lighten immeasurably the burden which cities, counties, and States are now required to carry for relief; and

Whereas the payment of said certificates will not create any additional debt (italics mine) but will discharge and retire an acknowledged contract obligation of the Government: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That since the Government of the United States is now definitely committed to the policy of spending additional sums of money for the purpose of hastening recovery from the present economic crisis, the American Legion recommends the immediate cash payment at face value of the adjusted-service certificates, with cancellation of interest accrued and refund of interest paid, as a most effective means to that end.

WHY NOT KEEP FAITH WITH THE RANK AND FILE?

Why not keep faith with the above-quoted resolution passed by the national convention on the tax-exempt bond racket? Do you suppose money expended for traveling and

entertaining expense has anything to do with their position on this legislation now pending before Congress? The Legion should support the Patman bill, under the resolution passed at the Miami convention above quoted.

There is no doubt but what the rank and file at the convention felt that they were voting for payment on their certificates as provided in the Patman bill. When read together, there can be no doubt in the minds of any disinterested person what the last expression of the rank and file is, as expressed on the tax-exemption resolution, when considered together with the Miami resolution calling for the payment of the balance due on the certificates which "will not create any additional debt." A one-eyed Chinaman knows that payment under H. R. 3896 will cost the taxpayers more than \$2,000,000,000 in interest.

RANK-AND-FILE SENTIMENT

Mr. Belgrano, in testifying before the committee, said:

The department commanders who are today in charge of their particular departments, the national executive committeemen who represent their departments in the national organizations, are 100 percent behind the Vinson bill.

The State commander for the American Legion for Texas, Mr. Miller Ainesworth, made speeches in my district after leaving Washington last week, and was scheduled to attend the Thirteenth Congressional District Legion convention held at Quanah on March 10. I wired that convention as follows:

MARCH 9, 1935.

Mr. L. W. MORRIS,

Post Commander American Legion, Quanah, Tex.:

Re telegraph, Shall we pass H. R. 1 or 3896? The House Rules Committee will decide Monday whether or not Patman bill may be offered as substitute for Vinson bill. The National Legion executive committee should be forced to call meeting and decide whether or not they will support Miami resolution or bonus. Belgrano and Taylor at heart have never favored payment of certificates. Their dilatory fight here has been to defeat payment and will defeat payment this Congress, no doubt, unless their attitude changes. Belgrano's bank connection and past action in reappointing Taylor legislative representative confirms hostile attitude toward payment of certificates. Vinson's bill only authorizes payment requires appropriation for payment. This Congress will not vote additional taxes to pay legislation; President says will veto either bill. Patman bill complete in itself and provides payment without additional tax burden, without additional interest, without bonds; will not unbalance Budget. Should be paid now for common good of all. Please wire convention's attitude.

W. D. McFARLANE.

There are 21 American Legion posts in my district and they were in attendance at this convention. On March 11 I received the following wire from them:

Congressman W. D. McFARLANE,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

The Thirteenth District Convention of the American Legion Department of Texas, held in Quanah, Tex., today, March 10, passed resolution endorsing H. R. 1, and ask that you give your support to the bill; this district includes 21 posts and authorized this wire.

MILTON GAINES.

H. R. HAYES.

VICTOR NOBLES.

In addition to this, I have received dozens of letters from commanders of the American Legion posts in different parts of the Nation going on record favoring the Patman bill. Banker Belgrano apparently does not know the sentiment of the rank and file of the Legion posts in the Nation.

STAY WITH THE PATMAN BILL

In conclusion, let me say again, in gratitude to Mr. PATMAN, who has made the fight for this legislation, for the benefit of the Government, which will be saved more than \$2,000,000,000 through the passage of his bill, and for the good feeling it will create among the rank and file of the ex-service men, for the good it will do for the general welfare of our country, we should enact the Patman bill and pay this long-past-due debt to the soldier.

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR DEFENDS FREEDOM OF CONSCIENCE, AND CALLS UPON MEXICO TO PRESERVE FUNDAMENTAL RIGHTS

Mr. FENERTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include therein a letter I wrote to the president of the American Federation

of Labor together with his reply and an enclosure which he sent me.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FENERTY. Mr. Speaker, the city of Philadelphia, in which my constituency is situated, has always been in the forefront of American cities in every movement that has to do with the happiness and rights of the people. Of this interest I need only call to your attention the gigantic mass meeting held there a few weeks ago to protest against the violation of natural rights and freedom of conscience by the present Government of Mexico.

The very fact that this gathering was attended by some thirty-five or forty thousand Philadelphians, with another 15,000 striving in vain to procure admittance, is in itself an impressive illustration of the devotion to human liberty that still exists in the city where American political freedom first found articulate expression. Remembering that it was a Philadelphia laboring group that was in the vanguard of those protesting against the suppression of religion in Mexico in 1926, I considered it my duty as a representative of a district that has a very large percentage of the laboring classes to ascertain on their behalf just what the present attitude of the American Federation of Labor is with regard to the existing Mexican policy of seeking to destroy religion in the hearts of the Christian and Jewish people of that country.

I am glad to inform you that the president of the American Federation of Labor, Mr. William Green, has responded courteously and in accord with the belief of all Americans with respect to freedom of conscience. As we in this House have repeatedly averred, and as my own resolution with regard to the Mexican situation emphasized as early as the first month of this session, so Mr. Green states that there is no desire on our part to interfere in the purely internal affairs of any sovereign people. He then reads a salutary lesson to the communistic group now misgoverning the Mexican Republic by pointing out that it is impossible for men to worship God according to the dictates of their consciences and their religious convictions unless adequate facilities be provided to enable them to exercise these rights. In view of the fact that the Government of Mexico has reduced the number of ministers of religion almost to the vanishing point, this warning comes at an especially opportune time.

Considering that Catholics have been shot and their orphanages and schools and churches wantonly defaced or confiscated, that the Southern Baptist missions have been closed because of the tyrannical laws against religion; recalling, too, that the Protestant Review, Puerto Rico Evangelico, complains that Protestants are forbidden to place crosses upon the tombstones of their dead, and that even the Mormon meeting houses have been closed, although the Mormons were in conformity with the laws on religion, and remembering as well that the lives of Mexican children have been debauched by teachings that are of such an unseemly character that I prefer not to detail them in public, the admonition of Mr. Green that "the right of men to worship in accordance with the dictates of their consciences, unrestricted and unrestrained by any force or power anywhere or in any place" has the tocsin ring of the revered bell that we cherish in Independence Hall in our old city. His concluding warning, stating the traditional American doctrine that civilization cannot endure or democratic institutions be maintained unless economic, religious, and political freedom be guaranteed to the people of all nations clothed with authority to exercise the principle of self-government, has about it the far-seeing sagacity of the Nation's founders.

I, therefore, am glad to read to you the following letters, one from myself to Mr. Green, asking him to state the attitude of the American Federation of Labor with regard to the violation of natural rights in Mexico, and the other, with its enclosure, from Mr. Green in response to my request:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., February 11, 1935.

HON. WILLIAM GREEN,
President American Federation of Labor,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. GREEN: Will you kindly let me know what attitude the officers of the American Federation of Labor are taking with regard to the present Mexican situation?

I have a constituency which is largely of the laboring group and of those who are extremely interested in the peaceful and satisfactory outcome of the Mexican question. Like all Americans they look with horror on any violation of the rights which in this country are guaranteed by the Constitution and upheld by the courts. I should appreciate it if you would let me know the attitude of the Federation so that I might quote it in my remarks to my constituents.

Very sincerely yours,

CLARE GERALD FENERTY.

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR,
Washington, D. C., March 2, 1935.

HON. CLARE GERALD FENERTY,
United States House of Representatives,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: Perhaps I can best make reply to your letter dated February 11 by enclosing a copy of a communication addressed to Martin Torres, general secretary of the Mexican Federation of Labor.

I have endeavored to set forth in the letter I sent to Secretary Torres, of the Mexican Federation of Labor, the attitude of the American Federation of Labor in defense of religious freedom and of the exercise of the right of all people to worship in accordance with the dictates of conscience.

Very truly yours,

WM. GREEN,
President American Federation of Labor.

Enclosure.

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR,
Washington, D. C., March 2, 1935.

MR. MARTIN TORRES,
General Secretary, American Federation of Labor,
Allende 24, Mexico, D. F.

DEAR SIR AND BROTHER: Please be assured that the information you transmitted in your letter dated February 1 has been given most thoughtful and careful consideration by the officers of the Pan American Federation of Labor. Furthermore, your letter was brought to the attention of the executive council of the American Federation of Labor.

The officers and members of the Pan American Federation of Labor and the officers and members of the American Federation of Labor are deeply interested in the economic, social, and industrial welfare of all the working people of Mexico. We desire to be helpful in every possible way in the elevation of social and economic standards throughout the Republic of Mexico. The right of self-government, freedom from interference on the part of one nation in the domestic affairs of another, and the preservation of all these elemental rights, such as freedom of the press, freedom of speech, economic freedom, and the exercise of the right of religious freedom, are cardinal principles with the organized labor movement of the United States of America. These principles were clearly and definitely enunciated in the opening address which I made to the Fifth Congress of the Pan American Federation of Labor, which was held in Washington in July 1927. I quote from this address as follows:

"Not only have we in mind economic freedom, the exercise of the right to organize, but we also have in mind the exercise of all other phases of freedom and liberty that are the inherent right of every man and woman in all the countries of the world. Men must be industrially free, intellectually free, and politically free. They must be permitted to give labor and service or withhold labor and service, individually and collectively, at their will or at their decision. In this respect the organized labor movement stands fairly and squarely upon these fundamental principles. There must be freedom of the press. The press in every country must be free, free to publish such articles as are not libelous, such articles as may be educational and helpful, even though they may meet with the stern opposition of special interest, plutocrats, autocrats of every country in the world. There must be freedom of conscience; the right to exercise religious freedom, the right of men to worship in accordance with the dictates of their consciences, unrestricted and unrestrained by any force or power anywhere or in any place. Men must be politically free. They must be accorded the right to participate in the affairs of Government, to exercise their political powers, their political rights, unrestrained and unopposed. Political freedom is the cornerstone of good government."

There has been some feeling of apprehension and misgivings aroused among the working people of the United States over press reports which allege that religious persecution has been directed toward citizens of the Mexican Republic in many cities and towns because they exercise the right to worship in accordance with the dictates of their conscience. Even though this disturbed state of mind does exist in a greater or lesser degree

within the United States, there is no sentiment in favor of any interference whatsoever in the domestic or internal affairs of the Mexican Republic.

The position of the American Federation of Labor upon the question of national sovereignty and self-determination was also set forth in the address which I delivered at the Fifth Congress of the Pan American Federation of Labor in the following terms:

"We believe in self-determination of nations; we believe in self-government; in the right of every nation and the people within each and every nation to work out their own destiny in accordance with their ideals and their desires and their hopes and aspirations, free from molestation by any other nation or any other country."

When working people are admitted to membership in the American Federation of Labor in the United States and Canada, they are assured that the American Federation of Labor stands uncompromisingly for the exercise of religious freedom, for the right of the individual to worship in accordance with the dictates of his conscience, and that the American Federation of Labor will utilize its economic and political power in protecting its members in the exercise of these inherent fundamental rights.

For obvious reasons, men cannot worship in accordance with the dictates of their consciences and their religious convictions unless adequate facilities are provided which will enable them to exercise these rights. I cannot believe that our civilization can endure or that free, democratic institutions can be maintained unless economic, religious, and political freedom are guaranteed to all the people of all nations clothed with authority to exercise the principle of self-government.

Because of our personal and official solicitation for the general welfare of the people of the Republic of Mexico, I express the hope, in behalf of the officers and members of both the Pan American Federation of Labor and the American Federation of Labor, that these cardinal, fundamental principles of human rights which I have enunciated will be defended and preserved by the masses of people within the Republic of Mexico.

I extend to you fraternal greetings and official assurances of cooperation and good will.

Fraternally yours,

WILLIAM GREEN,
President American Federation of Labor,
Chairman Pan American Federation of Labor.

Although, Mr. Speaker, I have already expressed my thanks to the American Federation of Labor and its president for his reply and his readily granted permission to make his letters public, I also take this opportunity to restate my appreciation of his courtesy.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. Sisson, for today, on account of illness.

To Mr. Lamneck, for today, on account of illness.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 40 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, March 14, 1935, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

266. A letter from the Chairman of the District of Columbia-Virginia Boundary Commission, transmitting a report of the progress of the Commission since it began to function, April 23, 1934; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

267. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting draft of a proposed bill to amend the Canal Zone Code, prepared by the Governor of the Panama Canal; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

268. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting request to adjust claims of Sioux Agencies, found meritorious, for loss of personal property; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. McREYNOLDS: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H. R. 4448. A bill to provide funds for acquisition of a site, erection of buildings, and the furnishing thereof for the use of the diplomatic and consular establishments of the United

States at Helsingfors, Finland; without amendment (Rept. No. 382). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. McREYNOLDS: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H. R. 6504. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act for the grading and classification of clerks in the Foreign Service of the United States of America, and providing compensation therefor"; without amendment (Rept. No. 383). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. DOUGHTON: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 3896. A bill to provide for the immediate payment of World War adjusted-service certificates, to extend the time for filing application for benefits under the World War Adjusted Compensation Act, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 384). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MAVERICK: A bill (H. R. 6670) to provide for the preservation of historic American sites, buildings, objects, and antiquities of national significance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. KELLY: A bill (H. R. 6671) to limit the working hours of all persons working on dredges or tugs on the Great Lakes to 8 hours a day, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. KNUTSON: A bill (H. R. 6672) to amend subdivisions (a) and (b) of section 400 of the Revenue Act of 1926, as amended, relating to taxes on cigars and cigarettes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McREYNOLDS: A bill (H. R. 6673) providing for an annual appropriation to meet the share of the United States toward the expenses of the International Technical Committee of Aerial Legal Experts, and for participation in meetings of the International Technical Committee of Aerial Legal Experts and the Commissions established by that Committee; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. McSWAIN: A bill (H. R. 6674) to create the Reserve Division of the War Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6675) to revise the promotion list of the Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MILLER: A bill (H. R. 6676) to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States", approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplemental thereto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6677) requiring contracts for the construction, alteration, and repair of any public building or public work of the United States to be accompanied by a performance bond protecting the United States and by an additional bond for the protection of persons furnishing material and labor for the construction, alteration, or repair of said public building or public work; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOTT: A bill (H. R. 6678) to add certain lands to the Rogue River National Forest in the State of Oregon; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. RAMSPECK: A bill (H. R. 6679) extending the classified executive civil service of the United States; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. BOYLAN: A bill (H. R. 6680) to provide for the bonding of Federal officials and employees; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. CASTELLOW: A bill (H. R. 6681) authorizing the erection of a marker suitably marking the site of the battle fought at Columbus, Ga., April 16, 1865; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. DISNEY: A bill (H. R. 6682) authorizing an appropriation for payment to the Osage Tribe of Indians on account of their lands sold by the United States; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. McCORMACK: A bill (H. R. 6683) to permit classification of certain unclassified employees of the United States by noncompetitive examination; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. MAAS: A bill (H. R. 6684) to retain the basic status and salary classification of surplus laborers in the Railway Mail Service; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. QUINN: A bill (H. R. 6685) to promote the public health and safety by providing for examination and registration of those who desire to engage in the occupation of beauty culture; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SNYDER: A bill (H. R. 6686) for the improvement of the Youghiogheny River Watershed, Pa.; to provide flood control; and to encourage agriculture, industrial, and economic development; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. BIERMANN: A bill (H. R. 6687) to establish the Bureau of Peace and Friendship for sociological research in matters connected with war; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. HENNINGS: A bill (H. R. 6688) to prohibit the sale, possession, and transportation of cannabis and its derivatives and compounds; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SUMNERS: A bill (H. R. 6717) to amend section 1 of the act of July 8, 1932; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. McLEOD: Resolution (H. Res. 160) providing for the consideration of H. R. 2847, to eliminate receiverships of closed banks, increase employment and purchasing power through replacement in circulation of funds now frozen in assets of closed banks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MAVERICK: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 211) to create a commission to study and report on the feasibility of establishing a national monument or monuments in the territory occupied by the Spanish colonial missions in the States of Texas, New Mexico, Arizona, and California; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. BULWINKLE: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 212) to investigate corporations engaged in the manufacture, sale, or distribution of agricultural implements and machinery; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROGERS of New Hampshire: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 213) consenting that certain States may sue the United States and providing for trial on the merits in any suit brought hereunder by a State to recover direct taxes alleged to have been illegally collected by the United States during the fiscal years ending June 30, 1866, 1867, 1868, and vesting the right in each State to sue in its own name; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STARNES: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 214) to extend the period of suspension of the limitation governing the filing of suit under section 19, World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nevada; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nevada; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Michigan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Indiana; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Texas; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin; to the Committee on Education.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Kansas; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Iowa; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Texas; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nebraska; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of North Carolina; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Commonwealth of Kentucky; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Jersey; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AMLIE: A bill (H. R. 6689) for the relief of Thomas Papalian; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 6690) granting an increase of pension to Susan Rehard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6691) for the relief of Alexandre Barna; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BIERMANN: A bill (H. R. 6692) for the relief of William Cornwell and others; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BRUNNER (by request): A bill (H. R. 6693) for the relief of Charles Levine; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CARPENTER: A bill (H. R. 6694) for the relief of Catherine McLinden; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DARDEN: A bill (H. R. 6695) for the relief of Daniel N. Farnell; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6696) for the relief of Bessie B. Hurd, formerly Bessie B. Fowlkes; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6697) for the relief of W. B. Fountain; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6698) for the relief of Mae C. Tibbett, administratrix; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6699) for the relief of Lottie May Bolin; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FENERTY: A bill (H. R. 6700) for the relief of Edward Aloysius Connor; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6701) for the relief of Samuel J. Burger; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mrs. GREENWAY: A bill (H. R. 6702) for the relief of Annie E. Daniels; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6703) for the relief of Joanna Forsyth; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. JOHNSON of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 6704) for the relief of James Monroe Caplinger; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FULMER: A bill (H. R. 6705) for the relief of James William Patterson; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. KIMBALL: A bill (H. R. 6706) for the relief of J. H. McLaughlin; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LEWIS of Maryland: A bill (H. R. 6707) for the relief of Frank B. Worden; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MAAS: A bill (H. R. 6708) to authorize the presentation of a Distinguished Flying Cross to Lt. Col. Francis T. Evans, United States Marine Corps; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MILLARD: A bill (H. R. 6709) for the relief of Leslie W. Miller; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6710) to provide for the retirement of certain enlisted men of the United States Marine Corps and of the Marine Corps Reserve who served as officers in the Garde d'Haiti; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MOTT: A bill (H. R. 6711) authorizing a preliminary examination and survey of Chetco Cove, Oreg.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 6712) granting a pension to Charles Alcorn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6713) granting an increase of pension to Charles S. Cooper; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SCOTT: A bill (H. R. 6714) to authorize the presentation of the Distinguished Service Cross to Walter H. Cobun; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STACK: A bill (H. R. 6715) for the relief of Harry Wainwright Hart; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 6716) granting a pension to Timothy A. Linehan; to the Committee on Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

3783. By Mr. ANDREW of Massachusetts: Petition of the General Court of Massachusetts, urging that Congress provide for payment of World War adjusted-compensation certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3784. By Mr. BEITER: Petition of the Seventy-seventh Division Post, No. 1488, of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, Buffalo, N. Y., urging the enactment of House bill 1, providing for payment of adjusted-compensation certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3785. By Mr. BOYLAN: Resolutions adopted at the regular meeting of the Holy Name Society of the Church of St. Matthias, held in the Borough of Queens, city of New York, State of New York, regarding conditions existing in Mexico; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3786. Also, resolution adopted by the World Trade League of the United States, regarding reciprocal trade agreements, etc.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3787. By Mr. BUCKLER of Minnesota: Petition of Mrs. Carl Lindberg, unit president, in behalf of the members of the Warren (Minn.) Auxiliary Unit of the American Legion, Department of Minnesota, of Warren and vicinity in Minnesota, praying for the passage of the Vinson bill (H. R. 3896), to make the immediate cash payment of the soldiers' adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3788. Also, petition of Katherine McDonald in behalf of the members of the American Legion Auxiliary Unit, Department of Minnesota, of Hawley and vicinity in Minnesota, asking for passage of the Vinson bill (H. R. 3896), to make the immediate cash payment of the soldiers' adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3789. By Mr. CARPENTER: Memorial of the House of Representatives (the senate concurring) of the State of Kansas, memorializing Congress to pass the Costigan-Wagner antilynching bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3790. By Mr. CHAPMAN: Petition of the Legislature of the Commonwealth of Kentucky, urging the immediate passage of Senate bill 212 and House bill 2066; to the Committee on Agriculture.

3791. By Mr. DORSEY: Petition signed by 75 residents of Philadelphia, Pa., registering their determined opposition to the Wagner-Lewis bill, and urging uncompromising support of Senate bill 2327; to the Committee on Labor.

3792. By Mr. HOEPEL: Petition of the citizens of Monrovia, Calif., urging enactment of the Costigan-Wagner antilynching bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3793. By Mr. KENNEY: Petition in the nature of a resolution of the Slovak League of America, of Pittsburgh, Pa., being in favor of the workers' unemployment and social insurance bill (H. R. 2827); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3794. By Mr. KVALE: Petition of 686 residents of the counties of Chippewa, Lac qui Parle, Lyon, Murray, and Yellow Medicine, State of Minnesota, urging adoption of the Townsend plan for old-age pensions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3795. Also, resolution of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, memorializing Congress to authorize the States to tax sales and gross income and/or gross receipts arising from transactions in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

3796. Also, petition signed by business men and members of Kendall P. Post, No. 237, of the American Legion of Balaton, Minn., urging the immediate payment of adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3797. Also, petition of 48 residents of the counties of Lac qui Parle and Big Stone, State of Minnesota, urging adoption of the Townsend plan for old-age pensions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3798. Also, resolution of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact a Federal antilynching law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3799. Also, petition of 974 residents of the counties of Chippewa, Lac qui Parle, Lyon, Nobles, and Renville, State of Minnesota, urging adoption of the Townsend plan for old-age pensions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3800. By Mr. LUCKEY: Memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Nebraska, memorializing the Congress and the President of the United States to enact a Federal antilynch law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3801. Also, memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Nebraska, memorializing the Congress and the President of the United States relative to the bushel-for-bushel seed-loan plan, and to urge overdue benefit payments of wheat and corn-hog contracts for 1934; to the Committee on Agriculture.

3802. By Mr. LUNDEEN: Petition of the Central Cooperative Association, South St. Paul, Minn., urging that interest rates on land-bank loans be reduced from 4½ to 3½ percent; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

3803. Also, petition of the Minnesota Brewers Association of St. Paul, Minn., urging the enactment of legislation reducing the tax on beer; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3804. Also, petition of the Common Council of the City of Rochester, Minn., urging the passage of the General Pulaski Memorial Day resolution now pending in Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3805. By Mr. PFEIFER: Petition of the Independent Pharmacists Products, Inc., Brooklyn, N. Y., urging consideration of the Mapes bill (H. R. 5062), the Wheeler Federal Trade Commission bills (S. 944, S. 1933); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3806. Also, petition of Meyer Sambur, Ph.G., Brooklyn, N. Y., urging support of Senate bills 944 and 1933 and House bill 5062; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3807. Also, petition of Mabel P. Schmidt, New York City, concerning the Ramspeck anti-Communist bill (H. R. 2897), and similar measures; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3808. Also, petition of the Holy Name Society of St. Matthias Roman Catholic Church, Ridgewood, Brooklyn, N. Y., protesting against the Mexican situation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3809. By Mr. ROGERS of Oklahoma: Petition of Ernest Caha and 192 other citizen residents of Mayes County, urging enactment of House bill 2856, introduced by Congressman WILL ROGERS, embracing a national system of old-age pensions to citizens of the United States past the age of 55 and not in the field of competitive earning; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3810. Also, petition of Rollin E. Adair and 18 other citizens and residents of Mayes County in Oklahoma, urging immediate action of Congress on House bill 2856, by Congressman WILL ROGERS, embracing a national system of old-age pensions to citizens of the United States over the age of 55 and not engaged in the field of competitive earning; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3811. By Mr. RUDD: Petition of Henry F. W. VonSellen, 164 Himrod Street, and 18 other citizens of Brooklyn, N. Y., concerning old-age pensions, only to citizens of the United States who have been citizens for past 10 years or more; to the Committee on Labor.

3812. Also, petition of the Holy Name Society of St. Matthias Roman Catholic Church, 1861 Catalpa Avenue, Ridgewood, Brooklyn, N. Y., concerning conditions in Mexico; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3813. Also, petition of Philip H. Cooper, corresponding secretary, subcommittee, Local No. 251, and 23 other citizens of Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring the passage of House bill 5445; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

3814. Also, petition of John J. Dougherty, 104-76 One Hundred and Twelfth Street, and nine other citizens of Richmond Hill, Long Island, N. Y., concerning the Rayburn-Wheeler public-utility holding companies bills (H. R. 5423 and S. 1725); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

3815. By Mr. SHANLEY: Petition of Polish National Alliance of the United States of North America, Group No. 513, 15 Prince Street, Wallingford, Conn.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3816. By Mr. STEFAN: Resolution adopted by the Nebraska House of Representatives, memorializing the Congress and the President of the United States relative to the bushel-for-bushel seed-loan plan, and to urge overdue benefit payments wheat and corn-hog contracts for 1934; to the Committee on Agriculture.

3817. Also, resolution of the Nebraska House of Representatives, memorializing the Congress and the President of the United States to enact a Federal antilynch law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3818. By Mr. SUTPHIN: Petition of the Pioneer Grange No. 1, Dayton, N. J.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3819. Also, petition of the New Jersey State Department of Agriculture, Trenton, N. J., urging regulation and control on the importation of milk; to the Committee on Agriculture.

3820. By Mr. TINKHAM: Petition of residents of Boston, Mass., favoring the Townsend plan of old-age revolving pensions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3821. Also, resolutions of the General Court of Massachusetts, memorializing Congress in favor of the immediate cash payment of the adjusted-service certificates of veterans of the World War; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3822. By Mr. TRUAX: Petition of Fairmount Post, No. 416, American Legion, Cleveland, Ohio, by their secretary, Carl Angelo, urging support of the Vinson bill to pay the adjusted-service certificates immediately; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3823. Also, petition of the Amita Club, Bedford, Ohio, by their secretary, Anthony J. Lau, demanding, for the sake of their security, that all members of the Labor Committee vote

favorably on the workers' bill (H. R. 2827), introduced by Congressman LUNDEEN; to the Committee on Labor.

3824. Also, petition of the Farm Bureau officials of Ohio, by their president, Perry L. Green, opposing legislation which shall attempt to fix a definite wage scale for those employed on public-works relief projects, which wage scale may tend to keep the unemployed from seeking permanent employment from those who sustain such employment from incomes derived from productive effort, and urging that no interpretation be placed on the above resolution which shall indicate that the Ohio Farm Bureau Federation is in any way opposed to a high wage scale obtaining for industrial or agricultural employment; to the Committee on Labor.

3825. Also, petition of the Farm Bureau legislative chairmen, presidents, and managers of county farm bureaus and cooperative associations from 80 counties of Ohio, by their president, Perry L. Green, going on record as favoring the adoption of the Wheeler amendment providing for the reduction of interest rates from 4½ to 3½ percent and opposing any effort to substitute for purposes of parliamentary evasion other bills which do not include the provisions of the Wheeler amendment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3826. Also, petition of Jetta Bradford and 40 other citizens of Oakland, Calif., believing that new inventions, and not relief legislation, will lift America out of the prevailing depression, and petitioning the Congress of the United States to immediately pass legislation establishing an inventors' loan fund, as there has been a heavy accumulation of inventions that have not been given to the world because their creators have not been financially able to have them patented; to the Committee on Patents.

3827. Also, petition of T. P. Johnston Post, No. 329, American Legion, Mount Gilead, Ohio, by their post commander, Dr. R. W. C. Francis, urging support of the Vinson bill (H. R. 3896) providing for the immediate cash payment of the adjusted-service certificates to veterans of the World War and the cancelation of past and future interest charges on loans received on these certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3828. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the city of Benld, Ill.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3829. Also, petition of the city of Ocean Beach, Calif.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3830. Also, petition of the city of Rochelle, Ill.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3831. Also, petition of the borough of Fairview, N. J.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3832. Also, petition of the city of Madison, S. Dak.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3833. Also, petition of the city of Fall River, Mass.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3834. Also, petition of the city of Ely, Minn.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3835. Also, petition of the city of Attica, Ind.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3836. Also, petition of the city of Salem, Mass.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3837. Also, petition of the city of Phoenix, Ariz.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3838. Also, petition of the county of Allegheny, Pittsburgh, Pa.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3839. Also, petition of the city of Moline, Ill.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3840. Also, petition of the city of Greenville, Tex.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3841. Also, petition of the borough of Cliffside Park, Bergen County, N. J.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3842. Also, petition of the city of Indianapolis, Ind.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3843. Also, petition of the city of Michigan City, Ind.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3844. Also, petition of the city of Ottawa, Ill.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3845. Also, petition of the town of East Hartford, Conn.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3846. Also, petition of the city of Oswego, N. Y.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3847. Also, petition of the city of Maplewood, Mo.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3848. Also, petition of the city of Lorain, Ohio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3849. Also, petition of B. C. Beetham and others; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3850. Also, petition of the city of Rahway, N. J.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3851. Also, petition of the city of Cicero, Ill.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3852. Also, petition of the city of Terre Haute, Ind.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3853. Also, petition of the borough of Somerville, N. J.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3854. Also, petition of the Nashville Wholesale Association; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3855. Also, petition of the city of Lebanon, Tenn.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3856. Also, petition of the city of Wilkes-Barre, Pa.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3857. Also, petition of the city of Frankfort, Ind.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3858. Also, petition of the city of Toledo, Ohio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3859. Also, petition of the city of Mitchell, S. Dak.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3860. Also, petition of the city of North Chicago, Ill.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3861. Also, petition of the city of Northampton, Mass.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3862. Also, petition of the city of Kenosha, Wis.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3863. Also, petition of the city of South Bend, Ind.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3864. Also, petition of the city of Klamath Falls, Oreg.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3865. Also, petition of Calumet City, Ill.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3866. Also, petition of the Walter J. Hatfield Post, No. 356, American Legion; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3867. Also, petition of the Colored Men's Progressive Association of Sweetwater County, Wyo.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3868. Also, petition of the D. of C. Society of the Sons of the American Revolution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3869. Also, petition of the D. of C. Society of the Sons of the American Revolution; to the Committee on the Library.

3870. Also, petition of the Farmers' Holiday Association of New Mexico; to the Committee on Agriculture.

3871. Also, petition of McFarland Post, No. 9, of the American Legion; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3872. Also, petition of the city of Camden, N. J.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3873. Also, petition of the Yuba-Sutter Bar Association; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3874. Also, petition of the Nine County Democratic League of Southwestern Washington; to the Committee on Agriculture.

3875. Also, petition of the National Association of Tobacco Distributors; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3876. Also, petition of the Westmoreland County Council of the Veterans of Foreign Wars; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3877. Also, petition of the Clio Club, Denver, Colo.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3878. Also, petition of Group No. 2519 of the Polish National Alliance; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3879. Also, petition of the Polish National Alliance, Group No. 2654; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3880. Also, petition of the Group No. 96 of the Polish National Alliance; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

THURSDAY, MARCH 14, 1935

(Legislative day of Wednesday, Mar. 13, 1935)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. ROBINSON, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Wednesday, March 13, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. McGill, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 6644) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1935, and prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1935, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. ROBINSON. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Coolidge	Keyes	Pope
Ashurst	Copeland	King	Reynolds
Austin	Costigan	La Follette	Robinson
Bachman	Couzens	Lewis	Russell
Bailey	Cutting	Logan	Schall
Bankhead	Dickinson	Loneragan	Schwellenbach
Barbour	Dieterich	Long	Sheppard
Barkley	Duffy	McAdoo	Shipstead
Bilbo	Fletcher	McCarran	Smith
Black	Frazier	McGill	Steiwer
Bone	George	McKellar	Thomas, Okla.
Borah	Gerry	McNary	Thomas, Utah
Brown	Gibson	Maloney	Townsend
Bulkley	Glass	Metcalf	Trammell
Bulow	Gore	Minton	Truman
Burke	Guffey	Moore	Tydings
Byrd	Hale	Murray	Vandenberg
Byrnes	Harrison	Neely	Van Nuys
Capper	Hastings	Norris	Wagner
Carey	Hatch	Nye	Walsh
Clark	Hayden	O'Mahoney	Wheeler
Connally	Johnson	Pittman	White

Mr. LEWIS. I announce that the Senator from Arkansas [Mrs. CARAWAY] and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] are absent because of illness, and that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. DONAHEY], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MURPHY] are necessarily detained from the Senate.

Mr. AUSTIN. I announce that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS] is absent because of illness, and that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. NORBECK] is detained from the Senate on official business. I ask that this announcement stand for the day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-eight Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

REPORT OF DAUGHTERS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Thirty-seventh Annual Report of the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution for the year ended March 31, 1934, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Printing.

REPORT OF RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Chairman and Secretary of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, submitting, pursuant to law, a report covering the operations of the Corporation for the fourth quarter of 1934, and from the period of its organization on February 2, 1932, to December 31, 1934, inclusive, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.